DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 795 FL 009 033

TITLE	The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation. First Report by the U.S. Commissioner of Education to the President and the Congress.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	HEW-OE-77-01704
PUB DATE	Nov 76
NOTE	127p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Bilingualism; Bilingual Students; *Educational Legislation; Educational Research; *Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Higher Education; Language Instruction; Language of Instruction; *Language Programs; Non English Speaking; *Program Descriptions; Program Development; Program Evaluation; Second Language Learning; State Programs; Statistical Data; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII

ABSTRACT

This report is the first attempt by the Office of Education to determine: (1) what the condition of bilingual education is in the United States, (2) what advances have been made, and (3) what problems remain to be solved. Following a discussion of the history and rationale of bilingual education, and the quantification of the need for bilingual education, resources required to meet the education needs of limited-English-speaking persons are considered. Fourteen Federal programs most directly concerned with meeting these needs are discussed, including the Bilingual Education Act, ESEA Title VII; the Emergency School Aid Act; the Vocational Education Act; the Adult Education Program; the Library Services and Construction Act; the Civil Rights Act, Title IV; the Education of Disadvantaged Children, ESEA Title I; the Supplementary Educational Centers and Services, ESEA Title III; Follow Through; Right To Read; special programs for students from disadvantaged backgrounds; the Indian Education Act, Title IV; the Strengthening Developing Institutions Program of the Higher Education Act, Title III; research on bilingual education carried out by the National Institute of Education; state bilingual education programs; and educational television. Evaluations of bilingual education and the administration of federal bilingual education programs are handled. Appendices include statistics relevant to bilingual education, and the 1975 survey of languages. (CLK)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: FL RC
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED146795

The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation

First Report by the U.S. Commissioner of Education to the President and the Congress

NOVEMBER 1976

FL009033

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Office of Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE / Office of Education

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.--No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

HEW Publication No. (OE) 77-01704

The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation

First Report by the U.S. Commissioner of Education to the President and the Congress

(as required by section 731 of Title VII, Elementary and Secondary Education Act)

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
David Mathews, *Secretary*
Virginia Y. Trotter, *Assistant Secretary for Education*
Office of Education
Edward Aguirre, *Commissioner*

Legislative Requirement for Report

Section 731, Title VII, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by Section 105(a)(1) of the Education Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380) requires the Commissioner of Education to prepare and submit to the Congress and the President a report on the condition of bilingual education in the Nation and on the administration and operation of this title and of other programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability. The report shall include -

(1) a national assessment of the educational needs of children and other persons with limited English-speaking ability and of the extent to which such needs are being met from Federal, State, and local efforts, including (A) not later than July 1, 1977, the results of a survey of the number of such children and persons in the States, and (b) a plan, including cost estimates, to be carried out during the five-year period beginning on such date, for extending programs of bilingual education and bilingual vocational and adult education programs to all such preschool and elementary school children and other persons of limited English-speaking ability, including a phased plan for the training of the necessary teachers and other educational personnel necessary for such purpose;

(2) a report on and an evaluation of the activities carried out under this title during the preceding fiscal year and the extent to which each of such activities achieves the policy set forth in section 702(a);

(3) a statement of the activities intended to be carried out during the succeeding period, including an estimate of the cost of such activities;

(4) an assessment of the number of teachers and other educational personnnel needed to carry out programs of bilingual education under this title and those carried out under other programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability and a statement describing the activities carried out thereunder designed to prepare teachers and other educational personnel for such programs, and the number of other educational personnel needed to carry out programs of bilingual education in the States and a statement describing the activities carried out under this title designed to prepare teachers and other educational personnel for such programs; and

(5) a description of the personnel, the functions of such personnel, and information available at the regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dealing with bilingual programs within that region.

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	SUMMARY	1
II.	INTRODUCTION	7
III.	BILINGUAL EDUCATION: HISTORY AND RATIONALE	9
IV.	QUANTIFYING THE NEED FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION	17
V.	RESOURCES REQUIRED TO MEET THE EDUCATION NEEDS OF LIMITED-ENGLISH-SPEAKING PERSONS	25
VI.	BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS	33
	INTRODUCTION	33
	BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT, ESEA TITLE VII	34
	EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT	43
	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT	46
	ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM	51
	LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT	54
	CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, TITLE IV	57
	EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN, ESEA TITLE I	63
	SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES, ESEA TITLE III	66
	FOLLOW THROUGH	68
	RIGHT-TO-READ	71
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS FROM DISADVANTAGED BACKGROUNDS	73
	INDIAN EDUCATION ACT, TITLE IV	77
	STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS PROGRAM, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT, TITLE III	81
	NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION: RESEARCH IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION	84
	STATE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS	85
	EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION	90
VII.	EVALUATIONS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION	95
VIII.	ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS	107

APPENDIXES

A.	Activities of the National Center for Education Statistics Related to the Bilingual Education Report	115
B.	1975 Survey of Languages	117

TABLES

1.	Size of Population by Language Groups	22
2.	Number of Teachers Required to Meet the Needs of Limited-English-Speaking Persons in the School-Age Population	27

Page

3. Numbers of Institutions of Higher Education Training Bilingual Education Personnel, by Language and Level of Assignment, 1975-76..... 29
4. Funding History of ESEA Title VII Bilingual Programs 1969-1976..... 37
5. Expenditures in 1974-75 for Limited-English-Speaking Persons as Reported by SEA's..... 87
6. Participation in Programs for Limited-English-Speaking Children..... 89

SUMMARY

The maximum number of persons of limited English-speaking ability in the Nation is estimated at 15 million. (See the analysis in chapter IV.) This number, based upon a Bureau of the Census survey conducted in 1975, is derived from questions about the place of birth, languages spoken in the households surveyed, and languages usually spoken by individuals surveyed. Because the methods used in the survey did not permit direct measurements of English-speaking ability, the estimate probably includes a substantial number of persons who are proficient in English, as well as those who are truly limited in their command of English. Until more definitive data collected in 1976 are analyzed, 15 million will be taken as the maximum number of persons in the Nation who may have a need for bilingual education.

About 24 percent of the 15 million, or 3.6 million, are 4 to 18 years of age and therefore of particular concern to the Nation's public and private schools. It is likely that many of these persons, because of their limited English-speaking ability, need special curriculums if they are to make satisfactory progress through school. Seventy-six percent, or 11.4 million, are over 18 years of age, but it is not possible at this time to estimate how many persons in the older population are seeking, or might in the future seek, to further their education.

It is also estimated that as much as 6 percent of the school age population has limited English-speaking ability. Spanish is by far the most prevalent non-English language spoken in the United States. Some 69 percent (2.1 million persons) of the school-age population speak it. While many other languages are spoken, only five of them account for more than 50,000 persons each: Italian, French, Filipino, German, and Chinese.

We have, then, an upper limit to the size of the limited-English-speaking population--3.6 million in the school-age population and 11.4 million adults. Bilingual education is not restricted, however, to those with limited English-speaking ability. For example, title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), while placing priority on persons of limited English-speaking ability, permits limited enrollment of English-speaking children. State and local laws and practices may be either more or less restrictive than the Federal law, depending upon judgments about the value of bilingual education for English-dominant students. As a result it is not possible to estimate the overall size of the population which might eventually participate in bilingual education if there were not constraints on resources. Most would agree, however, that for the present the highest priority for attention must be the limited-English-speaking population.

In light of the foregoing background on the target population, several questions can now be asked. What is the condition of bilingual education in the Nation? What advances have been made? What problems remain to be solved?

This report is the first attempt by the Office of Education to provide answers to these questions.

Compared to most aspects of the American education system, bilingual education is undergoing rapid evolution in terms of concept, implementation, public support, and involvement by the Federal and State governments. Though bilingual education in the Nation has a long history, it has been a fitful history until recently. After World War II, social forces for bilingual education gradually grew stronger until the mid-1960's, when they coincided with congressional action on major new Federal legislation in education--the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. By 1968, the law had been amended to include a special section on bilingual education and in fiscal year 1969, $7.5 million were appropriated to carry out the program. Though the amount of money was not large, the fact that the Federal Government formally acknowledged the potential of bilingual education provided impetus to further growth in the 1970's.

Since the 1920's a number of court decisions have removed restrictions against the use of languages other than English in the schools, and some of the more recent decisions have directly favored the spread of bilingual education. In Lau v. Nichols, the most famous case, the Supreme Court ruled that the San Francisco school district must provide special programs for children of limited English-speaking ability. Although the Court did not require bilingual education, that approach is certainly one way of assuring equal access to education. Some other cases, ruled on by lower courts, have required bilingual education as a course of action.

Court decisions have been accompanied by new laws in support of bilingual education. In some States, the changes merely remove prohibitions on the use of non-English languages as mediums of instruction. In addition, however, eight States now have laws which require bilingual education under certain conditions.

Federal legislation affecting bilingual education has also proliferated since passage of the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) in 1968. In addition to providing demonstrations of bilingual education in classrooms (44 different languages are used), the program currently (1976) provides about $25 million for training bilingual instructional personnel and about $7 million for development, testing, and dissemination of materials.

Although the original legislation is the most comprehensive and the largest in terms of money directly earmarked for bilingual education, two other pieces of legislation are especially pertinent: the bilingual education section of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) and the

Bilingual Vocational Training Program (BVTP). ESAA provides financial assistance to school districts that are desegregating and at the same time have a need for bilingual education. BVTP is for persons who are unemployed or underemployed because of limited English-speaking ability. BVTP also provides some training for persons to serve as instructors or counselors in vocational education and for the development of instructional materials and techniques.

One new Federal activity which may eventually have far-reaching importance for bilingual education is the establishment of nine centers across the Nation to help school districts implement educational programs for limited-English-speaking students and do so in compliance with the Lau v. Nichols decision.

Many other Federal programs give special attention to the limited-English-speaking population though not necessarily in the form of bilingual education. These programs provide funds for a wide range of educational activities, including adult education, vocational education, library programs, and financial help to developing institutions of higher education which serve large numbers of limited-English-speaking persons.

Expansion of inschool programs has been accompanied by the development of television programs designed to help children learn English and develop positive self-concepts and to help English-language children learn the language and culture of another ethnic group. The value of bilingual television lies in its potential for reaching a wide audience. Two Spanish-English series--Carrascolendas and Villa Allegre--are already being broadcast on many public television stations. Other programs are under development.

The overall picture of bilingual education and, more generally, of special activities to meet the educational needs of limited-English-speaking children is one of rapid growth and evolution, especially in the last 6 to 8 years. It is probably also true, however, that many persons who might benefit from bilingual education have no opportunity to do so. Although there is presently no nationwide, unduplicated count of the number of school-age persons participating in bilingual education, fragmentary evidence on participation indicates that less than one-half million students are in some form of bilingual education; what proportion comes from a limited-English-speaking background is not known, however. When compared to estimates of the size of the target population, this suggests that there are 2 to 3 million limited-English-speaking persons who are not participating in bilingual education. It is estimated that approximately 77 percent of persons from limited-English-speaking backgrounds are 19 years of age and older. It is likely that only a small proportion of them are participating in bilingual education, but it is also probably true that a relatively small proportion are seeking formal education in any form. In sum, while the trend

is to offer bilingual education to increasing numbers of limited-English-speaking persons, there remain substantial numbers who are not participating.

Bilingual education is thus advancing in terms of the number of persons participating and also in the variety of educational offerings. Federal activities provide clear evidence of this fact, but there is also a trend toward increasing support for bilingual education at the State and local levels. Action at the local level may accelerate notably as a consequence of the Lau v. Nichols case and similar court decisions.

What are the main factors which tend to suppress more widespread use of bilingual education? They seem to be three in number: limited availability of instructional materials, a shortage of qualified teachers, and absence of convincing evidence of the effectiveness of bilingual approaches.

Limited availability of materials is widely acknowledged as a problem in bilingual education. Availability is improving for Spanish-language materials, but schools using other languages still face severe problems. Commercially developed materials, especially Spanish/English, are now becoming available as are some materials whose development was fostered by title VII of ESEA. In 1975 the Office of Education greatly broadened its efforts to develop, test, and disseminate curriculums, so that approximately $7 million is now spent annually for those purposes. When these efforts come to fruition several years hence, the shortage of materials should be much less, although bilingual materials will never be available in as great a variety as English-only materials. Languages represented by small numbers of people--e.g., many of the Native American languages, languages of the Trust Territories, and the rarer Indo-European languages--will probably always be a problem because, even if heavily subsidized by the Federal Government, the costs per student will probably be very high because the market will be so small.

The bilingual education approach usually assumes that a teacher is fluent in two languages. However, there are apparently too few such teachers even for today's bilingual classrooms, and the continuing shortage of newly trained teachers will probably limit the expansion of bilingual education in the near future.[1]

Prior to 1975, most federally supported teacher training was in-service and accounted for expenditures of about $7 million per year.

---

[1] In current practice, when fully bilingual teachers are not available, the teaching load is often equally shared by two teachers or a teacher and an aide in such a way that both languages are used.

With the broader training authority added to ESEA Title VII in 1974, some $25 million is now being spent annually to increase the supply of teachers, including preservice and inservice training, graduate fellowships, and some support to enable colleges and universities to build up departments for training bilingual education personnel. Following the general development of bilingual education, there appears to be an increase in the number of colleges and universities offering training for bilingual teachers. A 1975 survey showed that 218 institutions offered training for teachers at the elementary and secondary level: 155 in Spanish, 26 in other European languages, 16 in Native American languages, and 21 in Asian languages.

The exact dimensions of the teacher shortage are difficult to gauge because neither the size of the target population nor the number of qualified teachers is known with much certainty. Although ongoing and planned surveys by HEW will clarify the extent of the shortage, the problem will probably exist for a number of years. Certainly there is little danger of a sudden surplus of bilingual teachers. As with the materials shortage, the situation is complicated by the large number of languages involved. By far the greatest need in terms of numbers is for Spanish/English teachers. For the nine other major languages a few thousand bilingual teachers in each language may suffice, and for the many rarer languages a few hundred teachers may fill the need. However, the fact that relatively few teachers are needed for languages other than Spanish may not make the problem any easier because colleges and universitites are less likely to have special programs for the other languages. Perhaps some kind of generalized teacher training, not restricted by languages, can fill the need.

The third factor which may constrain the use of bilingual education is the limited evidence of its effectiveness. Research results are sparse. There is little to guide educators in designing and implementing effective bilingual projects. The rationale for bilingual education seems logical and plausible and, during the recent years of rapid growth, the lack of data on the effects of bilingual education has done little to dampen enthusiasm for the approach. Usually, however, as new educational approaches mature, there is more of a tendency to ask for evidence of effectiveness, and the absence of evidence may therefore curtail expansion. In any case, more research and evaluation, especially a "planned variations" study of bilingual education, would provide a better basis than presently exists for rational expansion. Curriculum developers, teacher training institutions, and school systems can all benefit from clearer indications of how to meet the needs of the limited-English-speaking population.

II

INTRODUCTION

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENT

The Education Amendments of 1974 require the Commissioner of Education to submit to the President and the Congress two reports on the condition of bilingual education in the Nation. Briefly, the requirements for the First Report are to (1) assess the needs of persons of limited English-speaking ability and the extent to which the needs are being met; (2) report on the operation of the Bilingual Education Program and several other Federal programs--sections of the Emergency School Aid Act, the Vocational Education Act, the Adult Education Act, and the Library Services and Construction Act; (3) estimate how many teachers and other educational personnel are needed for bilingual education, and (4) describe the role of the HEW Regional Offices in bilingual programs.

For the Second Report on the Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation, the legislation adds the following requirements: (1) a survey to estimate the number of persons of limited English-speaking ability, and (2) a 5-year plan for extending bilingual education to all persons of limited English-speaking ability. The Second Report is scheduled for delivery to the President and the Congress in February 1978.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE PRESENT REPORT

This First Report provides information that meets the four requirements mentioned above plus information not specifically called for in the legislation. The history and rationale for bilingual education are briefly discussed first; then both pedagogical reasons supporting bilingual education and court decisions affecting its adoption are touched upon. Estimates are then made of the number of persons of limited English-speaking ability. These estimates are based upon the Current Population Survey conducted in the spring of 1975. More definitive data were collected in the spring of 1976, and more precise and detailed estimates will be presented in the Second Report.

A particularly difficult task posed by the legislation is to determine how well the needs of limited-English speakers are being met by Federal, State, and local programs. In this First Report, existing data about 14 Federal programs have been used to partially fill out the picture. However, since the data were not collected specifically for this report, categories of information and definitions are not uniform for all programs. Results of recent evaluations of ESEA Title VII are also presented as well as a description of developmental work designed to provide a low-cost way of replicating successful bilingual projects.

A brief survey of State programs was made to gather a small amount of information on these State activities. It was not generally possible to collect information on local programs. Wide-audience, bilingual television programs are covered, however. A description of HEW regional activities is provided as required by the legislation.

The Current Population Survey data on the numbers of limited-English speakers are used to estimate how many teachers are needed for bilingual education. However, since estimates of the numbers of qualified educators presently providing bilingual education are not as yet available, it is not possible at this time to estimate the size of the shortage.

TOPICS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE SECOND REPORT

As noted, the Second Report will include two topics not found in this First Report: a 5-year plan for bilingual education and a national needs assessment based on the results of a survey to estimate the number of persons of limited English-speaking ability. Collection of data for the survey, conducted by the Bureau of the Census under the direction of the National Center for Education Statistics, took place in the spring of 1976. When the analysis of the survey results is completed, it should provide much better information about the target population.

In addition, several ongoing studies will yield better data in a number of areas not fully covered in this report. For example, the results of a major evaluation of the impact on students of title VII will be available. This evaluation will, for the first time, provide uniform data, including two-language achievement test results, from a sample of title VII projects.

Another ongoing study of State bilingual education programs will provide better information on this particular area of increasing activity. If enough funds are available, a new survey in 1976-77 will examine the ways in which schools meet the needs of students of limited English-speaking ability. The results, based upon a representative sample of children, will provide improved information on how well the needs of these students are being met and on the extent of the teacher shortage.

Two ongoing studies concern the resources required for bilingual education. One is a survey of colleges and universities to identify and describe teacher training programs for bilingual education. The other is a study to identify available instructional materials for bilingual classrooms and the gaps in the present inventory.

These special studies plus updated information on Federal programs will be the basis for the Second Report.

III

BILINGUAL EDUCATION: HISTORY AND RATIONALE

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN UNITED STATES SCHOOLS

Given the many languages used in the world, it is not surprising that bilingual education has a long and international history. Although the United States is presently less multilingual than many other countries (in terms of the percentage of persons who speak a language other than the dominant language) a great many of its citizens are immigrants from non-English-speaking countries and many more are descendants of such immigrants. Moreover, three-quarters of a million Native Americans speak an Indian tongue as their first language. As a consequence, the number of languages spoken within the boundaries of the United States and its territories is perhaps exceeded only by India and the USSR.

From the Nation's earliest days, non-English schools flourished as a way of meeting the needs of a diverse population.[1] However, many of the nonpublic schools were not bilingual; rather, they used the native tongues as a medium of instruction and taught English as a second language. For most of the 19th century, German was almost the only non-English language permitted in the public schools as a medium of instruction. French in Louisiana and Spanish in New Mexico were exceptions.

Then, during the first half of the 20th century, and especially after World War I, bilingual education seems to have become less prevalent. For probably a variety of reasons, support for it apparently diminished.

After World War II, however, conditions began to change. The 1960's saw the re-emergence of bilingual education. One program which seems to have had widespread influence was established for Cubans fleeing from the Castro regime. That program, established in Miami in 1963, was quickly followed in 1964 by two programs in Texas: in Webb County and San Antonio. During the next few years, several other programs were established; all were Spanish/English except for a Navajo/English project at Rough Rock, Arizona. In 1968 passage of the Bilingual Education Act gave national attention to the needs of persons of limited English-speaking ability. That legislation has greatly accelerated the adoption of bilingual education, both directly as a result of Federal dollars appropriated for the program, and indirectly as a result of increasingly favorable public opinion.

The role of the courts has been a slowly developing factor in the history of bilingual education. During the 1970's, court decisions have assumed new prominence in bilingual education.

---

[1] See Anderson, T., and Boyer, M. Bilingual Schooling in the United States. Austin, Texas; Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1970.

COURT DECISIONS

It is beyond the scope of this report to summarize all of the legal implications of court decisions bearing upon bilingual education.[2] Some of the important court cases should be noted, however, because they have affected the condition of bilingual education in the Nation. Recent decisions promise to have an even greater impact.

Although the Lau v. Nichols case in 1974 is usually regarded as a key turning point for bilingual education, earlier court decisions have also been important. From the 1920's through the 1940's, several court actions[3] removed constraints on foreign language instruction in the schools. For example, Mayer v. Nebraska struck down a State law forbidding the teaching of a foreign language on the grounds that to do so was an infringement of the liberty to acquire knowledge. In other cases similar decisions followed which permitted foreign language instruction, and presumably bilingual education, but which did not deal directly with the plight of limited-English-speaking persons seeking education in a school system whose main language of instruction was English. The situation changed with the Lau v. Nichols case.

In this case, on January 21, 1974, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on educational discrimination through inaction. At that time, the San Francisco school district was held accountable for not providing special programs for 1800 students of Chinese ancestry. It was ruled that such children, because of their limited English-speaking ability, had been denied equal access to the educational programs of the school district.

The Court's decision was based upon the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and associated Federal regulations published by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The regulations define inaction on the part of a school district as educational discrimination. They state:

> Where inability to speak and understand the English language excludes national origin-minority group children from effective participation in the educational program offered by a school district, the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students. (35 Fed. Reg. 11595)

---

2 For a review of legal precedents pertinent to bilingual education cases, see Grubb, E. B. "Breaking the Language Barrier: The Right to Bilingual Education," Harvard Civil Rights - Civil Liberties Law Review, Volume 9, 1974.

3 Geffert, H. N., et al. "The Current Status of U.S. Bilingual Education Legislation." Papers in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education Series, 4. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974.

While the Lau v. Nichols decision certainly advances the cause of limited-English-speaking students in that schools must address these students' special needs, the Court did not require that bilingual education be provided. Indeed, the Court did not specify a remedy but instead turned the problem back to the lower court and the school district to work out an appropriate solution.

Another issue, raised by Justice Harry A. Blackmun in a concurring opinion, is the point at which schools are obligated to provide special instruction. The Lau case was in behalf of a large number (1800) of students and Justice Blackmun indicated that he did not regard the case as conclusive when very small numbers of children are involved. It seems likely that the number of children involved will be a factor in some future court cases.

As a followup on the Lau case, HEW is pursuing two courses of action. The Office of Civil Rights is reviewing the compliance of other school districts with respect to the conditions of discrimination which led to the Court ruling. In addition, the Office of Education (USOE) is providing funds to help school districts address the problems identified in the Lau case. More information on the USOE program can be found in chapter VI.

In another important case similar to Lau, the trial court, in Serna v. Portales Municipal Schools, ruled that the Spanish-speaking plaintiffs in a New Mexico school district did "not in fact have equal educational opportunity and that a violation of their constitutional right to equal protection exists." The court fashioned relief in the form of a bilingual/bicultural program. In July 1974, the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the lower court and affirmed that the appellees have a right, under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to bilingual education. The Court of Appeals also declined to alter the bilingual/bicultural program set forth by the trial court.

A class action suit, Aspira of New York, Inc. v. Board of Education of the City of New York, started in 1972, was finally settled by a Consent Decree in August 1974. The school board agreed to establish bilingual programs for all children whose English language deficiency prevents them from effectively participating in the learning process and who can more effectively participate in Spanish.

The issue of how much power the courts should have in bilingual cases is illustrated by Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado. The parents of public school students had sought relief from alleged segregation in the schools. The District Court found that the school district maintained a dual system so it adopted a desegregation plan including provisions for the bilingual/bicultural education of minority students. The bilingual/bicultural program ordered by the court on a trial basis touched, in the view of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, virtually every aspect of curriculum planning, methodology, and

philosophy which would ordinarily be the responsibility of local school authorities. Consequently, the appeals court ruled, in August 1975, that the District Court had overstepped the limits of its remedial powers. The interpretation of this decision was somewhat clouded because the main issue faced by the courts was that of school segregation.

It should be evident from the foregoing examples that, while conditions and outcomes may vary somewhat, the general trend is for court rulings in favor of plaintiffs who charge that school districts do not adequately address the special needs of limited English-speaking children. Although the courts do not always require bilingual education as a remedy, their actions are in accord with the more general trend for support of bilingual education in the United States.

PEDAGOGICAL RATIONALE

While there may be several bases for bilingual education, including social, political, and legal, the pedagogical rationale is of greatest concern here. Schools should be seeking better ways for children to learn. In the case of minority group children whose dominant language differs from that of the schools, Engle has posed two questions which are paramount: (1) Will a child learn to read more rapidly in his second language if he is first taught to read in his dominant language? and (2) Will the child achieve greater general knowledge of other subject matter areas in his school language if he is taught these subjects first in his native language?[4]

Many informed educators would answer yes to both questions; indeed government policies in support of bilingual education seem to start with that usually unstated premise. Federal bilingual legislation provides, for example, that:

> there is instruction given in, and study of, English and, to the extent necessary to allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system, the native language of the children of limited English-speaking ability, and such instruction is given with appreciation for the cultural heritage of such children, and with respect to elementary school instruction, such instruction shall, to the extent necessary, be in all courses or subjects of study which allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system.

In other words, it seems quite plausible, and axiomatic to some, that early, formal education in the native language would enable a

---

4 Engle, P. L. "Language Medium in Early School Years for Minority Language Groups." Review of Educational Research, 1975, Volume 45, No. 2, 283-325.

child to progress more effectively through a school system in which the main medium of instruction is a second language to the child. It is obvious, for example, that if a child cannot comprehend the words being used for instruction, then the child certainly cannot understand the concepts being taught. Assuming, however, that communication takes place in the native language, instruction can proceed in various ways. For example, reading can be restricted to the native language until those skills are well developed; the second language would then be introduced. Or the second language could be introduced orally and followed by reading in the second language but with no reading in the native language. The first example is regarded as part of a bilingual approach; the second is not. From here on the differences between bilingual education and other approaches multiply. In a bilingual education program the native language is used as the medium of instruction for other subjects in the early school years while the nonbilingual approach uses the second language. Other differences can be cited[5], but for brevity we shall simply say that bilingual education is the use of two languages as mediums of instruction.

Despite the plausible educational rationale for bilingual education, a related body of supportive research has not emerged. Research on bilingual programs has largely been conducted outside the United States in countries such as Canada, Norway, the Philippines, and Ireland. The applicability of these studies to conditions in the United States is unknown, and few investigations under comparable conditions have been initiated in this country. Furthermore, the few studies that have been conducted in the United States have looked at programs which are not typical of most programs in public schools.

The major contribution of the investigations of bilingual education is essentially methodological; they tell us not to repeat similar procedural pitfalls. The studies have not shown consistent results[6] in part because of methodological problems and also because they were conducted under widely different circumstances; there were different program objectives, program approaches, levels of teacher training, types of children, and so on. The methodological problems include inappropriate selection of evaluation instruments, faulty evaluation design, failure to document the form of the bilingual program offered, and insufficient attention to the impact of attitudes held by either the community or the teachers and administrators. Moreover, the research does not even provide substantial evidence that bilingual education is better than a nonbilingual approach. Consequently, the pedagogical rationale for bilingual education must rest upon reasonable but unproven assumptions.

---

5 Ibid.

6 See, for example, Venezky, R. L. "Nonstandard Language and Reading." Elementary English, 1970, 47, 334-45, and Engle, P. L., op. cit.

It is argued, for example, that using the native language has linguistic, psychological, and sociological advantages. The linguistic argument says that language is part of a total system for conceptualizing and transmitting ideas and therefore includes a way of thinking, or viewing the world, as well as communicating with other individuals. For reasons which may be deeply imbedded in the cultures, direct word-for-word translation from one language to another is difficult. Therefore, when a child enters school it is best for him to continue to learn in his native language rather than to immediately face not only the added task of learning a new language but also learning different ways of conceptualizing the world of experience. Of course, since the research evidence is not strong, not all linguists agree with this particular position.[7]

Psychologically, it is generally presumed that teaching a child in the native language will lead to greater self-esteem than if he/she is required to adopt a second language for school purposes. If only the second language is used to impart knowledge, the child may see the native language as less worthy than the second language and, by extension, that the speakers of the native language are also less worthy. While this argument seems plausible, there appears to be no empirical evidence to support it.

A more sociological argument in favor of bilingual education begins with the notion that the school is but one part of the environment in which the child must function. As Ramirez and Castaneda have said, "the way a person communicates, relates to others, seeks support and recognition from his environment (incentive motivation) and thinks and learns (cognition) is a product of the value system of his home and community."[8] It therefore seems reasonable for schools to build upon the strengths of the environment and culture from which a child of limited English-speaking ability comes rather than to plunge the child immediately into an unfamiliar school setting with conventions and values which may be distinctly different from those to which he/she has been accustomed.

Finally, there is the obvious point that when the native language is used, children can begin to learn subject matter immediately upon entry into school. This is a desirable end in its own right. However, there may also be an indirect effect in that by not falling behind their English-dominant peers, positive self-images of limited-English-speaking students may be preserved.

---

7 Paulston, C. B. "Implications of Language Learning Theory for Language Planning: Concerns in Bilingual Education." Papers in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education Series, 1. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974.

8 Ramirez, M., and Castaneda, A. Cultural Democracy, Bicognitive Development and Education. New York: Academic Press, 1974

In sum, educators and other experts probably cannot completely agree upon a pedagogical rationale for bilingual education. However, this state of affairs should not be surprising given that current understanding of human learning processes is quite undeveloped. Advocates of bilingual education have, however, suggested a number of plausible reasons why the two-language approach might be effective; the cause of limited-English-speaking persons in the United States would be advanced by more empirical research on the theoretical foundations of bilingual education.

IV

QUANTIFYING THE NEED FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

There are presently no hard data with which to make direct[1] estimates of the need for bilingual education. That is, there has been no count of the number of persons in the Nation who have limited English-speaking ability. However, data do exist which can be used to place a reasonable upper bound on the number of persons who might have difficulty speaking and understanding English. Moreover, work is underway to get better estimates in accordance with the congressional requirements.

This First Report on the Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation uses certain parts of the Survey of Languages supplement to the Current Population Survey, conducted by the Bureau of the Census in July 1975, as a basis for population estimates. The Second Report will draw upon a special survey conducted in the spring of 1976, and will be directly responsive to the legislative requirement. A description of the second survey is given in Appendix A. The estimates in the present report are offered as preliminary data for use until the more definitive findings become available.

THE SURVEY OF LANGUAGES

A Survey of Languages was conducted by means of a special supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS) of July 1975. The CPS is a household survey conducted monthly by the Bureau of the Census for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Its primary purpose is to obtain national estimates of the labor force status of the United States population. A number of special questions about language use were added to the July 1975 CPS by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Approximately 42,000 households in every State and the District of Columbia responded to the questions about language. The data were collected by trained interviewers who conducted 10 to 15 minute interviews with responsible adult household members. Each respondent supplied information about himself/herself and all other household members 4 years of age and older. Although there was no direct measurement of limited English-speaking ability, questions were asked about place of birth, language spoken in the household, and the usual language spoken by each of the individuals in the household. Answers to these questions were then analyzed to draw inferences about the number of limited-English-speaking persons in the country. More details about the survey may be found in Appendix B.

---

1 A direct estimate implies the use of objective (psychometrically valid) measures as opposed to subjective, opinion-based measures usually associated with household interviews or school-based, teacher judgments.

The Bilingual Education Act provides the following definitions:

(1) The term "limited English-speaking ability," when used with reference to an individual, means--

(A) individuals who were not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English, and

(B) individuals who come from environments where a language other than English is dominant, as further defined by the Commissioner by regulations and, by reasons thereof, have difficulty speaking and understanding instruction in the English language.

(2) The term "native language," when used with reference to an individual of limited English-speaking ability, means the language normally used by such individuals, or in the case of a child, the language normally used by the parents of the child. (Section 703(a), Bilingual Education Act, Title VII, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by Public Law 93-380).

The law thus suggests that there are three kinds of individuals who may have limited English-speaking ability, namely, those who (1) usually speak a language other than English, (2) come from an environment where a language other than English is dominant, or (3) are foreign-born.

An individual in any one of these categories does not necessarily have a limited command of English. For example, some foreign-born persons come from countries where the predominant language is English and are therefore likely to be proficient in English. (The 1970 Census indicates that about 10 percent of the foreign-born population was from the United Kingdom and Ireland. Another 8 percent came from Canada, though a part of this grouping would be predominantly French-speaking.) The point is, however, that persons in the three categories set forth in the law should include almost all persons with limited English-speaking ability (and, of course, some who can get along quite well in English). A count of such individuals should put an upper limit on the number of persons with limited English-speaking ability. This upper limit will be called (somewhat inaccurately) the non-English language background population, and a count of that population is what the Survey of Languages provides.

There are two complicating factors, however. The first is that a given individual may belong in one, two, or all three of the categories. This is not really a problem except when it comes to describing the results; then it makes matters somewhat complex. The second factor is

more difficult to cope with. The problem here is with the second category--persons coming from an environment where a language other than English is dominant. What exactly does that mean?

The approach taken in the Survey of Languages is to regard a person's household as the best indicator of the linguistic environment and to ask two questions about language used in the household: (1) What language is usually spoken in the household? (2) What other language, if any, is spoken in the household? Having the answers to both of these questions permits some flexibility in dealing with the second category.

To summarize up to this point: The main analysis of the Survey of Languages consists of tabulating the answers to four basic questions (paraphrased): (1) What is the usual language spoken in the household? (2) What other language is spoken in the household? (3) What is the place of birth for each individual in the household? (4) What is the usual language spoken by each individual in the household?[2] The answers to these questions can provide an estimate of the size of the non-English language background population. Two ways of analyzing the data are described below.

The first estimate is the count of all individuals who fall into one of the following categories:

1.	Persons who usually speak a language other than English	7,255,000
2.	Persons (other than the above) who live in households where the usual household language is not English	1,287,000
3.	Persons (other than the above) who live in households where the usual household language is English but where another language is spoken	15,836,000
4.	Additional foreign-born persons not included above	3,311,000
5.	All others for whom a language other than English is the usual household language or the individual's language, or who are foreign-born	231,000

[2] This question was aked only if a non-English language was spoken in the household.

6. Persons for whom the usual household and individual language was not reported but who live in a household where a non-English language is spoken and who are native-born	735,000
	28,655,000

Examination of the individual categories is helpful in judging the number of limited-English-speaking persons likely to be found in this population. It may be supposed that many, perhaps most, of the persons in the first category would have limited English-speaking ability. The persons in the second category usually speak English but come from an environment where a language other than English is usually spoken, so some of them may have limited English-speaking ability. The third category is much more problematic. Persons in this category usually speak English and come from households where English is dominant, but where another language is also spoken. It seems likely that most of these people would not have problems conversing in English. The fourth category is composed of "additional" foreign-born persons--that is, those who live in households where only English is spoken. It is unlikely that many of these persons are of limited English-speaking ability. The fifth category is comprised of a small population of which many members are probably limited in English-speaking ability. The final category includes cases for which some data are missing and which are therefore difficult to assess in terms of language proficiency.

Overall, it is likely that a substantial number of persons in this population are not limited in their English-speaking ability; consequently this estimate will be referred to as the Broad Estimate. However, by being broad, this population, which totals almost 28 million, must certainly include almost everyone of limited English-speaking ability.

A second estimate of the non-English language background population is based upon the following categories:

1. persons who usually speak a language other than English	7,255,000
2. persons (other than the above) who live in households where the usual language is not English	1,287,000
3. foreign-born persons not included above	6,424,000
4. all others for whom a non-English language is the usual household language or the individual's language, or who are foreign-born	231,000
	15,197,000

Categories 1 and 2 are the same as in the preceding list of categories--many people in them probably have limited English-speaking ability. Category 3 includes foreign-born persons in circumstances where probably few have limited English-speaking ability. Category 4 probably includes many limited-English-speaking persons.

For ease of reference, this estimate will be known as the Narrow Estimate even though many people in category 3 are probably not limited-English speakers. On the other hand, the Narrow Estimate does not include persons residing in households in which the usual language is English, but in which a non-English language may be spoken. Quite possibly, some of them would have limited English-speaking ability. All things considered, it seems likely that, of the two estimates, the Narrow Estimate is the more reasonable. This estimate, which gives a population of 15 million, also seems to correspond closely to what the legislation defines as the preconditions for limited English-speaking ability. It will be used in the rest of this report.

SIZE OF THE POPULATION BY AGE GROUPS

The sizes of several important age groups are summarized below:[3]

Age	Number of Persons
4-5	481,000
6-18	3,118,000
19 and over	11,597,000
	15,196,000

Thus, the number of persons of school age (preschool, elementary and secondary) is about 3.6 million. Since the total school age population 4 through 18 years of age is about 57.8 million, this means that 6 percent of the total have a non-English language background. This analysis also shows that 76 percent of the persons with a non-English language backgound are 19 and over. For persons of school age, the need for education can perhaps be best met by bilingual education. For persons 19 and older, it may be assumed that many are not seeking further education, but for those that are, bilingual education may again be the best response.

SIZE OF THE POPULATION BY LANGUAGE GROUPS

The next point of interest is the prevalence of various languages among the non-English language background population. Table 1 shows the number of persons in each language covered by the Survey of Languages.

---

[3] The sum by age groups does not quite correspond to the total given earlier because of round-off error.

TABLE 1
SIZE OF POPULATION BY LANGUAGE GROUPS

Persons Whose Usual Household Language Is Not English, or Whose Usual Individual Language Is Not English, Including Persons Born Outside the United States, and Foreign-born Persons Not Included in These Groups, by Language Background and Age Group: United States, July 1975.

HOUSEHOLD LANGUAGE BACKGROUND	Total	by selected age group (in thousands) 4-5	6-18	6-13	14-18	19-25	26-50	51 & over
Total persons	15,197	481	3,118	2,003	1,114	1,540	5.145	4,912
Selected European								
French	624	7	94	47	47	70	192	263
German	760	10	85	57	29	53	269	342
Greek	248	3	45	33	13	18	93	83
Italian	993	15	126	86	39	56	257	541
Portuguese	188	10	44	23	21	7	78	50
Spanish	5,851	301	1,834	1,249	586	706	2,092	916
Selected Asian								
Chinese	411	17	70	38	33	62	161	101
Filipino	292	5	87	56	30	10	120	61
Japanese	216	8	26	19	7	14	103	64
Korean	179	15	48	37	10	14	78	22
Other	2,076	40	222	139	82	180	702	931
Foreign born and others whose language background is not determined	3,359	50	437	220	216	338	1,000	1,531

Note: Estimates of less than 50 thousand persons are not considered statistically reliable and are expected to change considerably as a result of further surveys and analysis by the National Center for Education Statistics. A report to the Congress on the results is due July 1, 1977, and will be used in a second report on The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation, due February 1, 1978.

The table clearly shows that the Spanish language is by far the most common non-English language spoken in the United States, both in total and across all age categories. For example, an estimated 5.9 million persons 4 years of age and older usually speak Spanish or live in a household where Spanish is the dominant language. Some 2.1 million of them are of school age, 4 through 18. Among the population for which a language is identified,[4] Spanish thus accounts for 49 percent of the overall population and 69 percent of the school-age group. Italian is the next largest language group, but it accounts for only 7 percent of the overall total and 4 percent of the school-age group. Other than Spanish, just five languages are represented by more than 50,000 persons each in the school-age population: Italian, French, Filipino, German and Chinese.

SUMMARY

A survey of 42,000 households in 1975 provides the basis for estimating the number of persons, age 4 and older, with a non-English language background. This estimate, which may be regarded as an upper limit to the number of limited-English-speaking persons in the Nation, is about 15 million. The corresponding school-age population, 4 through 18, numbers 3.6 million.

Aside from adult education or postsecondary education, the number of persons who might benefit from bilingual education should be somewhat less than 3.6 million. A special 1976 survey should provide more precise estimates. The number of limited-English-speaking persons over 18 who are seeking further education and therefore might benefit from bilingual education is not known.

Among persons likely to have limited English-speaking ability, Spanish is by far the most prevalent language--49 percent of the group 4 years of age and over, 69 percent of the school-age group. No other single language accounts for more than 7 percent and 4 percent, respectively. Of the 15 million, the Spanish language was represented by over 5.8 million, and all other languages accounted for about 6 million. For over 3.3 million persons in the 15 million total, the dominant language was either English or was not determined.

---

[4] The last row in Table 1 indicates the number of persons for whom no language was identified.

V

RESOURCES REQUIRED TO MEET THE EDUCATION NEEDS OF LIMITED-ENGLISH-SPEAKING PERSONS

INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, estimates were made of the upper limit of the number of limited-English speakers in the Nation. It was also indicated that more precise data are being gathered and that the results will be reported in the Second Report on the Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation.

To determine the resources required to meet needs, there are other data problems. There are no good estimates of human and material resources presently available for meeting the education needs of limited-English speakers. Although it is reasonably clear that there are not enough bilingual education teachers or instructional materials, limitations in the data prevent quantification of these shortages. The approach, then, is to determine the upper bounds of the needs. The Second Report will provide more precise estimates of the size of the resource shortages and estimates of the costs of eliminating the shortages.

Based on the Survey of Languages as reported in the previous chapter, the number of persons of school age who might benefit from bilingual education should be less than 3.6 million persons. There are an additional 11.6 million persons 19 and over, but resource estimates will not be made for that population at this time because it is not known how many are seeking further education.

TEACHERS

To estimate the number of teachers needed for elementary and secondary education, several assumptions must be made. They are summarized below:

(1) The size of the target population is 3.6 million limited-English-speaking children distributed among languages as indicated by table 1 in chapter IV. That is, the current upper limit of the target population is taken as the estimate of the population size over the next few years.

(2) Twenty percent of the target population will be so isolated that bilingual programs will not be feasible for them. This accounts for situations where there are very few limited-English speakers in a given school at a given grade level.

(3) In the average bilingual classroom, the ratio of non-English dominant to English dominant students is 3:1. This, of course, increases the number of teachers required but avoids segregating the non-English dominant students. There is some limited evidence that the current ratio is smaller.

(4) The average pupil-teacher ratio is 24.1:1 in elementary schools. This number is used as a surrogate for average classroom size which is more desirable but not available. The average classroom size is always somewhat larger than the pupil-teacher ratio.

(5) The average pupil-teacher ratio is 19.8:1 in secondary schools and one out of every three teachers of limited-English-speaking students is bilingual.

With these assumptions, it is possible to estimate the number of bilingual classrooms required and therefore the number of bilingual teachers needed. The results are given by language in table 2. In considering the estimates, it is important to remember that unknown numbers of persons are presently working as bilingual teachers, are available and qualified for such jobs, or are in college, training to teach bilingually. To estimate the size of the teacher shortage at some time in the future, it will be necessary to make estimates of the number of teachers likely to be available and subtract from the numbers in table 2. Such estimates will be made in the Second Report on the Condition of Bilingual Education.

With the assumptions given, it is estimated that 129,000 bilingual education teachers are needed to meet the needs of the target population. The two most striking features of table 2 are that, of the total teachers required, 61 percent are needed for the Spanish language, and 84 percent of the total required are at the elementary school level. The large numbers for "other" indicate that many teachers are needed for the many languages which occur with relatively low frequency in the population. This is supported by the fact that the ESEA Title VII program operates projects in 44 languages, of which only 10 are reported on table 2. Thus, there are 34 other languages, and probably many more than that, for which bilingual education teachers are needed. It seems likely that the number of teachers required, at least for the 10 languages reported in table 2, are of sufficiently large numbers to merit special programs designed to prepare bilingual education teachers.

TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

The need for 129,000 bilingual education teachers means a potentially large market for properly trained persons. The market is potential because it cannot be assumed that school districts will seek to hire as many bilingual teachers as may be needed. However, it does appear that

the demand for bilingual teachers will grow and the next question is: Where will they come from?

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF TEACHERS REQUIRED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF LIMITED-ENGLISH-SPEAKING PERSONS IN THE SCHOOL-AGE POPULATION

Language	Elementary[1]	Secondary[2]	Total
Spanish	67,760	10,523	78,283
Italian	4,415	700	5,115
German	2,929	521	3,450
Filipino	2,667	539	3,206
Chinese	2,404	593	2,997
French	2,361	844	3,205
Korean	2,273	180	2,453
Greek	1,792	233	2,025
Portuguese	1,443	377	1,820
Japanese	1,180	126	1,306
Other[3]	19,628	5,351	24,979
Total	108,852	19,987	128,839

---

1 Elementary is defined for purpose of this table as ages 4-13 inclusive.

2 Secondary is defined as ages 14-18 inclusive.

3 This category was based upon persons whose language was not determined or for whom the language reported was not one of the 10 reported individually in the table.

A survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics in 1975-76 found 218 institutions of higher education offering some form of training in bilingual education for elementary and secondary schools. A breakdown by language and type of training is given in table 3. The offerings in these institutions range from a few specialized courses to complete programs offering degrees or certificates in bilingual education. A followup survey is underway to classify the institutions more exactly and to estimate the number of bilingual teachers emerging from their programs. The results will be presented in the Second Report on the Condition of Bilingual Education.

In the meantime, the Office of Education is taking steps to increase the capacity of institutions of higher education to train bilingual teachers by providing title VII grants to institutions to stimulate them to establish or improve bilingual education departments. In 1976 it is planned to award Program Development Grants to about 40 institutions of higher education at a maximum of $100,000 each.

In addition to grants to institutions, in 1976, 38 institutions in 16 States were selected to award Office of Education fellowships to bilingual education teacher trainers. Approximately $4 million is being provided for approximately 670 fellowships to master's or doctoral candidates to qualify them to train others as bilingual education teachers. Ten languages are represented in the fellowship program.

Most title VII training funds are used for preservice or inservice training. Preservice traineeships for approximately 856 undergraduate or graduate students planning to serve in local school system bilingual education programs will be awarded in 1976 at a maximum cost of $3,500 per trainee, for a total of $2,995,000. In addition $9,375,000 is budgeted for inservice training of staff associated with local classroom projects. It is anticipated that about 25,000 persons will receive training in this program. The number of Resource Training Centers will be expanded to 13 in 1976 at a cost of $5,000,000. A major function of these centers is to provide training to local project staff based on a needs assessment. It is anticipated that about 8,600 persons associated with local projects will receive training in the next school year.

TABLE 3

NUMBERS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TRAINING BILINGUAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL, BY LANGUAGE AND LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENT, 1975-76

	Elementary/Secondary				Postsecondary	
	Teachers	Supervisory & Administrative	Special Personnel[1]	Other[2]	Teachers	All Others
Asian[3]	21	3	4	4	10	2
Native American	16	3	7	12	4	2
Spanish	155	25	33	46	33	14
Other European[4]	26	3	4	3	8	1
TOTAL	218	34	48	65	19	30

1 Support Staff, including counselors, psychologists, librarians, etc.

2 Primarily teacher aides

3 Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, and Korean

4 French, German, Greek, Italian, Portuguese, and Russian

BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Bilingual instructional materials are, like teachers, generally in short supply. Apparently because of the limited market, commercial educational publishers have until recently hesitated to commit themselves to development costs. In the past few years, some Spanish/English materials have become commercially available, but the small size of the target populations in other languages will probably cause publishers to proceed cautiously, if at all.

To deal with problems of the small market, the Federal Government, primarily through the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education, has supported development of bilingual materials. For example, since 1969, over $21 million in ESEA Title VII funds have been spent in the development and dissemination of materials. Although the greatest development has been in Spanish, materials are also being developed in French, Portuguese, Greek, Italian, several Asian languages, and many Native American languages. Most of these materials are not yet ready for widespread classroom use.

Two other sources of materials for schools are possible. Commercial materials developed in foreign countries are sometimes available. However, they may have limited usefulness because the content or language form is somewhat inappropriate for United States schools. Materials may also be developed in the local school districts. Although limitations of funds and qualified curriculum developers tend to severely constrain local development, this approach may be appropriate for supplementary materials and may be the only feasible approach for the less common Native American languages.

To date there has been no good compendium of bilingual instructional materials available. This lack will be partially remedied soon by publication of a study, sponsored by the National Institute of Education, of materials available in five languages. It will later be supplemented by an ongoing Office of Education study which will extend the scope to include additional languages and describe materials under development as well as those already available.

Although the overall dimensions of the materials shortage problem will be brought into clearer focus by the above studies, the Federal Government, as noted earlier, is moving to fill some of the gaps. Materials either developed or under development in Federal projects include:

- Curriculum for grades K-3 in Greek and Italian
- Social studies, math, science, and fine arts materials for grades 6-9 in Spanish
- A multimedia social studies program in Spanish and English
- Navajo curriculum for grades K-6

- The first Navajo-English dictionary
- Materials in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, and Samoan for prekindergarten through grade 3
- Materials in French and Portuguese for grades K-6
- Criterion-referenced tests for Spanish children in grades 1-6.

In 1975, the Office of Education funded a network of centers to develop, test, and disseminate bilingual materials. Until that time, developmental activities had been carried out by a few centers and by local school districts. The network of centers concentrates the developmental activities in a more intensive and extensive manner and promises more systematic development of higher quality materials. The network will be expanded as necessary to fill identified needs.

VI

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to describe education programs carried out in behalf of persons of limited English-speaking ability. While the emphasis is upon bilingual programs, information about other activities designed to meet the needs of the target population has also been included to present a more complete picture.

Fourteen Federal programs, which probably are most directly concerned with meeting the special educational needs of limited-English speakers, are discussed. Some of these programs, such as ESEA Title VII and ESAA, have legislative requirements to support bilingual education. Other programs, such as ESEA Title I and Right to Read, were not designed specifically to provide bilingual education but may of course do so as necessary to accomplish their own objectives.

Another way in which Federal programs differ is in the way they are administered. Some, such as ESEA Title VII, are discretionary grant programs: the Office of Education makes a direct grant to a local school district. With such a program, it is relatively easy to pursue a particular educational strategy and, since the Office of Education administers the programs, substantial information is available about program activities. At the other extreme are large programs like ESEA Title I or Vocational Education, which have broad purposes and are administered by the States. The Federal administrative role is quite limited, and the emphasis placed upon a particular educational approach such as bilingual education varies considerably among the States. Also, in State administered programs, little is known about the exact nature of the activities or what kinds of children benefit: data reporting requirements are minimal in keeping with the limited Federal role. One side effect of the differing administrative modes is that the apparent importance of various programs for limited-English speakers is distorted by the relative amounts of information available. Thus it is possible for a large program like ESEA Title I to have a great but unknown (and therefore unreported here) impact upon bilingual education.

The number of State programs for bilingual education has increased gradually over the years, but little is currently known about their scope or the number of persons served. Available information is presented in this chapter, but a thorough treatment must await the Second Report, which will include the results of an ongoing study of State programs.

Bilingual education programs offered and financially supported by local school districts are an unknown factor. It is hoped that a study

planned for school year 1976-77 will throw light on the extent to which the needs of school-age, limited-English speakers are met by local programs. At this time, however, data are not available.

Television affords the opportunity to expose a large number of people to bilingual education in at least a minimal way and at relatively low cost. It also offers a partial solution to the shortage of qualified bilingual educators. This chapter looks at the programs currently offering bilingual instruction.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT, ESEA TITLE VII

It is currently estimated that approximately 3.6 million school-age children in the United States have a non-English language background. This number includes children from homes where a language other than English is spoken and children who were foreign-born or whose parents were foreign-born.

To provide an equal educational opportunity to children of limited English-speaking ability, and to help local education agencies (LEA's) start programs to meet the needs of these children (3 to 18 years of age), Congress in 1968 enacted Title VII of ESEA (the Bilingual Education Act), which encourages the establishment and operation of educational programs using bilingual education practices, techniques, and methods at the elementary and secondary levels; encourages training of persons planning to participate or already participating in such programs; and encourages curriculum reform and innovation. The act authorizes the Commissioner to provide financial assistance for the following activities:

- discretionary grants to local educational agencies or to institutions of higher education (including junior or community colleges) applying jointly with one or more local educational agencies for the development and demonstration of bilingaul education programs.

- grants or contracts to carry out training activities by (a) institutions of higher education (IHE's) which apply, after consultation with, or jointly with one or more local educational agencies; (b) local educational agencies; and (c) State educational agencies (SEA's).

- the establishment, publication, and distribution by the Commissioner of suggested models of bilingual education with respect to pupil-teacher ratios, teacher qualifications, and other factors affecting the quality of instruction offered in such programs.

- fellowships for study in the field of training teachers for bilingual education.

- development of materials, curriculums, and other steps leading to the development of bilingual education programs.

- reform, innovation, and improvement in graduate education and in the structure of the academic profession.

In addition, this title authorizes the Commissioner to make payments to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out programs of bilingual education for Indian children on reservations served by elementary and secondary schools operated by the Department of Interior.

School districts and other applicants apply directly to the U.S. Office of Education for grants. Applicants submit proposals which are judged on the basis of the need for bilingual education, the quality of the proposed educational approach, and the quality of the plans for administering and evaluating the project. Proposals must include provisions for the participation of children from nonpublic schools and for participation by parents and other community members.

Program Philosophy

The philosophy underlying this legislation holds that children with limited English-speaking ability can be guided from the "known to the unknown." This guidance involves instruction in the dominant language while helping the youngster gain competence in the English language. The bilingual education technique, then, makes use of two languages: English, and the one the child uses at home.

This approach does not involve mere translation; instead it uses the languages interchangeably, one at a time, often at different times of the day. The student performs drills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, in both languages, learns the history and culture associated with both languages, and acquires the skills and knowledge necessary to academic development and progress, regardless of language.

Bilingual education is not viewed as a compensatory effort. Although instruction in English as a second language is a necessary part of instruction, it is not sufficient to establish a bilingual education program. A bilingual education program recognizes the need to provide instruction in native language and cultural skills to the extent necessary to enable a child to progress effectively through the educational system. It values cultural differences; it values the learning the child receives at home and in the community; and it values languages as a transmitter of culture.

Program Budget and Scope

Since its inception, the appropriations for bilingual programs under ESEA Title VII have grown from $7,500,000 to $96,270,000 in 1976.

Table 4 shows the scope of the program for those years.

An examination of the table indicates that from fiscal year 1975 appropriations, a total of $84,825,274 was obligated. This amount includes $52,836,176 awarded to LEA's for 319 classroom demonstrations, of which 68 were new starts. An estimated total of 162,124 students benefited directly from these demonstrations. Projects are located in 35 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands. The demonstrations cover 44 languages, including 17 Native American, 17 Asian and Pacific, and 10 Indo-European languages. An amount of $5,245,416 supported the inservice training of 13,985 personnel associated with these demonstrations. Additionally, $6,546,000 supported preservice traineeships for 3,273 personnel.

Table 4 also shows that for 1976 approximately $59,364,000 will be awarded to LEA's for about 425 classroom demonstrations, of which 176 will be new starts, and serving about 190,000 students. Approximately $10,231,800 will be committed for inservice training of about 30,000 personnel associated with classroom demonstrations. In addition, it is anticipated that $3,275,000 will be obligated for supporting preservice traineeships for about 856 personnel.

Other program funds supported graduate fellowships and grants to institutions of higher education to develop or expand and improve their bilingual education training capabilities. They also supported a network of centers to assist funded projects and to develop, assess, and disseminate instructional materials and information. The training and centers network components of the program are discussed further in the remaining sections of this chapter.

This program is forward funded. Consequently, funds appropriated and obligated in one fiscal year are used by grant and contract recipients the succeeding year, e.g., fiscal year 1976 funds will be used by recipients during fiscal year 1977, i.e., academic year 1976-77.

TABLE 4

FUNDING HISTORY OF ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL PROGRAMS 1969-1976[1]

	1969	1970	1971	1972
TOTAL AUTHORIZATION	$30,000,000	$40,000,000	$80,000,000	$100,000,000
TOTAL APPROPRIATION	$ 7,500,000	$21,250,000	$25,000,000	$ 35,000,000
TOTAL OBLIGATED FOR PROGRAMS	$ 7,469,966	$21,185,110	$24,863,846	$ 33,506,433
TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS	76	131	164	217
AVERAGE COST PER PROJECT	$ 98,289	$ 162,000	$ 155,318	$ 154,407
TOTAL OF CHILDREN SERVED[2]	26,521	51,918	83,748	108,816
AVERAGE PER PUPIL COST	$282.00	$408.00	$297.00	$308.00
TOTAL INSERVICE COSTS	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
NUMBER TRAINED	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
TOTAL FOR GRADUATE FELLOWS	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
NUMBER OF RECIPIENTS	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
TOTAL FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
NUMBER OF AWARDS	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
TOTAL FOR RESOURCE CENTERS	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
NUMBER OF CENTERS	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
TOTAL FOR MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT & ASSESSMENT & DISSEMINATION CENTERS	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
NUMBER OF CENTERS	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 4 (con't)

FUNDING HISTORY OF ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL PROGRAMS 1969-1976

	1973	1974	1975	1976 (estimates)
TOTAL AUTHORIZATION	$135,000,000	$135,000,000	$135,000,000	$140,000,000
TOTAL APPROPRIATION	$ 45,000,000	$ 66,350,000	$ 85,000,000	$ 96,270,000
TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	$ 33,249,418	$ 67,235,681	$ 84,825,274 3/	$ 96,270,000 4/
TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS	209	380	319	425
AVERAGE COST PER PROJECT	$ 159,088	$ 176,936	$ 165,630	$ 139,680
TOTAL OF CHILDREN SERVED	129,280	339,595	162,124	190,000
AVERAGE PER PUPIL COST	$257.00	$198.00	$326.00	$312.00
TOTAL INSERVICE COSTS	-0-	-0-	$ 5,245,416	$ 10,231,000
NUMBER TRAINED	-0-	-0-	13,985	30,000
AVERAGE COST PER TRAINEE	-0-	-0-	$375.00	$341.00
TOTAL FOR PRESERVICE TRAINEESHIPS	-0-	-0-	$ 6,546,000	$ 3,275,000
NUMBER TRAINED	-0-	-0-	3,273	750
TOTAL FOR GRADUATE FELLOWS	-0-	-0-	$ 3,000,000	$ 4,000,000
NUMBER OF RECIPIENTS	-0-	-0-	474	708
TOTAL FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	-0-	-0-	$ 3,790,000	$ 6,000,000
NUMBER OF AWARDS	-0-	-0-	35	100
TOTAL FOR RESOURCE CENTERS	-0-	-0-	$ 3,560,583	$ 5,000,000
NUMBER OF CENTERS	-0-	-0-	7	16
TOTAL FOR MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT & ASSESSMENT & DISSEMINATION CENTERS	-0-	-0-	$ 6,270,102	$ 7,000,000
NUMBER OF CENTERS	-0-	-0-	12	16
AWARDS TO STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION	-0-	-0-	-0-	$ 1,200,000
NUMBER OF AWARDS	-0-	-0-	-0-	38

1/ With the exception of the authorization and appropriation, all totals are estimated figures.
2/ These are estimated figures of children served.
3/ Includes $54,000 for the Advisory Council; $730,000 for a needs assessment; and $2,797,997 for Vocational Education Training.
4/ Includes $100,000 for the Advisory Council and $100,000 for planning of bilingual education clearinghouse.

Models for Bilingual Education

The Office of Education, through a contract with the American Institutes for Research (AIR), identified four bilingual projects that could serve as models for project planners and managers elsewhere. In order to be considered as models, the projects were required to include instruction in English language skills for children limited in those skills, instruction in the customs and cultural history of the child's home culture, and instruction in the child's home language to the extent necessary to allow him to progress effectively through school. In terms of effectiveness, project participants had to show statistically and educationally significant gains in English language skills, as well as in subjects taught in the home language. The project had to have clearly definable and describable instructional and management components.

Candidates for the search came from program staff of ESEA Title VII and of other ESEA and ESAA titles which support bilingual education projects; from the files of previous searches for effective projects; and from State bilingual education officials, school districts, and regional educational laboratories.

The bilingual project models identified by AIR and approved by the Dissemination Review Panel of the Office of Education as appropriate for national dissemination follow:

(1) Bilingual Education Program
Alice Independence School District
Alice, Texas

Spanish - In 1973-74 the project served 528 children in grades K-4 in four schools.

(2) Aprendemos en Dos Idiomas
Title VII Bilingual Project
Corpus Christi Independent School District
Corpus Christi, Texas

Spanish - In 1973-74 the project served 519 children in grades K-3 in three schools.

(3) Bilingual Education Program
Houston Independent School District
Houston, Texas

Spanish - In 1973-74 the project served 1,550 children in grades K-12 in 8 elementary schools, one junior high, and one high school. (Validation of the program was for grades K-4 only.)

(4) St. John Valley Bilingual Education Programs
Maine School Administrative District #33
Madawaska, Maine

French - In 1973-74 the project served 768 children in grades K-4 among the three school districts that cooperate in the project.

Such identification of the above models is within the language of Public Law 93-380, which obliges the Commissioner of Education to "...establish, publish, and distribute, with respect to programs of bilingual education, suggested models with respect to pupil-teacher ratios, teacher qualifications, and other factors affecting the quality of instruction offered in such programs."

Thorough descriptions of the projects are being distributed through the Title VII Resource Centers in order to provide educators with models and ideas for implementing similar practices in bilingual education. The project descriptions will include information on the context in which the projects have been developed and have operated, and the educational needs of those district's children, which the projects have helped to meet. The project descriptions serve as a source of ideas for project planners, teachers, administrators, school boards, and PTA's. Also, they are the starting point for the development of Project Information Packages for each of the four projects, providing educators with complete information and guidance toward rapid development of nearly identical projects in school districts elsewhere. The Project Information Packages are produced as part of the Office of Education's "Packaging and Dissemination" Program, which operates under the authority of the Special Project Act in Title IV of Public Law 93-380 (Education Amendments of 1974). Plans are being made by the Office of Education to field test the Bilingual Project Information Packages in schools in 1977-78.

The variations in concentrations of limited-English-speaking-ability children in a district, the number of different languages involved, the ages of the youngsters, the degree of native language competency, and the degree of English language competency suggest that different model approaches may be appropriate in different situations. Hopefully, through ESEA Title VII grants for demonstrating various models of bilingual education, the appropriate models will be discovered for different groups of children who have non-English language and cultural backgrounds.

Building Capacity for Bilingual Education

The Bilingual Education Act, as amended, and the rules and regulations established to carry out the Act reflect, in part, the experience of the program's operation and the results of formal evaluations conducted at the national level by the Office of Education and at the local

level by the title VII projects. Program evaluations have consistently pointed to two areas in which there are critical shortages of the resources needed to implement effective programs. One shortage pertains to adequately trained teachers for bilingual education; the other refers to appropriate curricular materials for those programs. The Office of Education's response, called the "capacity-building" strategy, uses significant amounts of title VII program resources to:

(1) encourage the training of teachers for bilingual education projects and of training the teachers of those teachers

(2) promote the materials-development, materials-dissemination, and technical assistance aspects of the national program.

--Teacher Training. While the classroom demonstration projects have always included some inservice training and curriculum development, they reach only a small number of students. The Education Amendments of 1974 emphasized training needs by requiring that $16 million of the first $70 million appropriated be used for training, and that one-third of the amount above $70 million be similarly earmarked. These funds should increase the capacity of the Nation's education system to serve the special needs of the non-English speaking student.

It is estimated that almost 129,000 bilingual teachers will be required to meet the needs of the English-language-deficient target population. (The basis for this estimate is explained in Chapter V.) While the exact number of bilingual teachers now available is not known, a large shortage is believed to exist. Toward correcting this deficiency, approximately $22 million was allocated to LEA's and institutions of higher education in 1975 and $28 million in 1976 to support a variety of training programs. These training programs include:

(1) INSERVICE TRAINING - In connection with ongoing classroom projects, $5.2 million in 1975 and $10.2 million in 1976 funds will provide training for about 14,000 administrators, parents, counselors, teachers, and aides participating in 1975 funded projects and about 30,000 such participants in 1976 funded projects.

(2) SCHOLARSHIPS - About $6.5 million in 1975 funds provided traineeship stipends to 3,273 personnel preparing for participation in local bilingual education projects. About $3.2 million in 1976 funds will provide stipends for 750 trainees. These awards, made by the LEA's, assist recipients achieve degrees and/or accreditation in the field of bilingual education.

(3) GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS - In fiscal year 1975 a total of 474 fellowships were awarded through 30 universities in 13 States at a cost of $3 million. It is anticipated that $4 million in 1976 funds will support about 700 awards. This program is designed to increase the supply of, and provide additional graduate training for, trainers of teachers in bilingual education programs in institutions of higher education. These, in turn, will provide a resource for increasing the number of bilingual education teachers available for local school system projects.

(4) PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT - Grants in the amount of $3.8 million in 1975 to 35 institutions of higher education and $6 million in 1976 to 100 institutions will support the development of their bilingual education training capabilities.

Resource Centers, discussed below, are another training resource. Seven such centers were supported with $3.6 million in 1975 funds, and it is anticipated that about 16 centers can be funded with $5 million in 1976 funds.

--Centers Network. In the past, the development of materials was largely a local responsibility with the exception of a few materials development centers. The materials developed by these centers were limited and disseminated through infrequent conferences, as well as by informal means.

Under the new law, USOE's Office of Bilingual Education is able to operate a large network of centers. There are three types: Resource Training Centers, which provide immediate services to LEA's; Materials Development Centers, which provide materials in the language of the target groups being served; and the Dissemination and Assessment Centers, which assess, publish, and distribute the materials developed.

Resource Training Centers are primarily responsible for (a) providing direct services to classroom teachers within funded local educational agencies and institutions of higher education and (b) coordinating services with State education agencies (SEA's). After the initial funding period from fiscal year 1975, funding priorities concentrate on program planning, staffing, and development of procedures. Resource Training Center services are expanding the scope of their services to include technical assistance in program planning and operation, evaluation of programs, materials utilization, staff development, and dissemination of information on effective program practices and procedures. In addition, the Resource Training Centers will conduct needs assessments for the Materials Development Centers and will be responsible for coordinating the field-testing of materials within a given region.

Materials Development Centers are responsible for developing bilingual-multicultural student materials and materials specific to teaching skills in the languages of the target groups being served as determined by needs assessments conducted by the Resource Training Centers. The materials developed at these centers are to be field-tested by the Resource Training Centers, which provide direct services to LEA's. The materials will then be distributed by the Dissemination and Assessment Centers.

Dissemination and Assessment Centers function both in supportive and technical-leadership roles in providing services to the network of centers. Their primary role is to evaluate, publish, and distribute instructional materials and to disseminate professional information on curriculum, training, human resources, evaluation, and assessment. Their function includes assessment of the appropriateness of materials designed for publication and the effectiveness of materials utilized in programs, and overall program assessment with a view to possible identification of successful models.

In 1975, 12 Materials Development and Assessment/Dissemination Centers were awarded a total of $6,270,102, and 7 Resource Training Centers were awarded a total of $3,560,583. Thus for the first time an orderly and logical division of labor has been established to get bilingual instructional materials that are needed in the classroom. It is expected that the number of centers will increase in 1976 to account for more languages and to narrow the geographical area that each must now cover.

EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT

Overview

The Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA), Title VII of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92-318), was passed by the 92nd Congress and signed into law on June 28, 1972. Under its authority financial assistance was made available for the following purposes:

- to meet the special needs incident to the elimination of minority group segregation and discrimination among students and faculty in elementary and secondary schools

- to encourage the voluntary elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students

- to aid school children in overcoming the educational disadvantages of minority group isolation.

ESAA funds are allocated for specific activities authorized in the legislation. Eighty-two percent of each year's total ESAA appropriation is made available for apportionment among the States. The act allocates $75,000 to each State plus an additional amount based on its proportion of minority group children, with no State receiving less than $100,000. The ESAA State apportionment programs include Basic Grants, Pilot Project Grants, and Nonprofit Organization Grants.

The remaining 18 percent of the total ESAA appropriation is reserved for specific set-aside programs and discretionary projects which are administered by the Office of Education. The ESAA national programs include Bilingual Grants, Educational Television Projects, Special Projects, and Evaluation Contracts.

In fiscal year 1974 a survey was conducted to determine the number of Spanish-surnamed students enrolled in school districts with ESAA projects. Of the $233,355,147 total fiscal year 1974 ESAA obligation, $96,351,199 (41.3 percent) was awarded for projects in school districts which enrolled a substantial number of Spanish-surnamed students. Some 344 (31.8 percent) of the total 1,038 ESAA projects were awarded for projects in school districts with a substantial number of Spanish-surnamed students (24 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands). Of approximately 6.8 million students enrolled in these school districts, about 1.9 million (28 percent) had Spanish surnames.

ESAA Bilingual Grants

Under Section 708 (c) of Public Law 92-318 (as amended by Public Law 93-380) ESAA Bilingual Grants may be awarded to local education agencies in which minority group children are not receiving an equal educational opportunity because of language and cultural differences. The grants are awarded for the purpose of developing or implementing bilingual/bicultural curriculums to improve the reading, writing, and speaking skills of minority group children from environments in which English is not the dominant language. The projects are also designed to enhance mutual interracial and interethnic understanding. To qualify for a Bilingual Grant an LEA has to be implementing an eligible desegregation or minority isolation plan and meet the requirements for a Basic Grant. Bilingual Grants may also be awarded to nonprofit organizations to develop bilingual/bicultural curriculums at the request of an eligible LEA.

ESAA applications for Bilingual Grants are evaluated according to specific selection criteria by the Office of Education regional staff and non-Federal review panels with special expertise in bilingual educational programs and school desegregation. Following the review and evaluation process, the applications which receive minimally acceptable rating scores are placed in rank order nationally and funded from top to bottom until all funds made available in ESAA's initial funding phase

are exhausted. Bilingual applicants are also eligible to participate in the subsequent resubmission process during which low scoring applications can be revised and resubmitted for further competition for ESAA set-aside funds.

Under the ESAA legislation, 4 percent of the total ESAA appropriation is authorized for Bilingual Grants. Following is a 3-year funding analysis:

	Appropriation	Obligation	No. of Projects
1973	$ 9,111,000	$ 8,888,013	39
1974	9,958,000	[1] 10,857,968	47
1975	9,052,000	9,052,000	34
	$28,121,000	$28,797,981	120

[1] Amount in excess of authorization made possible through addition of funds reserved to the Assistant Secretary under section 708(a)(2) of the Act.

School districts receiving the 34 ESAA Bilingual Grants in fiscal year 1975 reported a total enrollment of 1,160,295 students: 680,385 or 58.6 percent minority enrollment and 479,910 or 41.4 percent nonminority enrollment. Of the total enrollment some 317,045 students or 27.3 percent have been identified as "non-English dominant."

School districts estimated that some 93,045 students, or 8 percent of the total enrollment in the LEA's, will participate in the projects in fiscal year 1975:

Black	10,505 (11.3 percent)
American Indian	155 (0.2 percent)
Spanish-surnamed	46,801 (50.4 percent)
Oriental	723 (0.8 percent)
Other Minority	113 (0.1 percent)
Other Participants	34,658 (37.2 percent)

Approximately 5,000 students from nonpublic schools participating in the bilingual projects have been identified but not included in the public school participation figures.

Representative Program Descriptions: ESAA Bilingual Projects

-- San Francisco, California. A bilingual grant to the San Francisco Unified School District provided support for bilingual/bicultural instruction in basic skills to elementary students in four major language areas: Spanish, Chinese, Filipino, and Japanese. Additional program support for staff and materials development was provided through State funding.

Special instructional features included multiracial classes, English as a second language, bilingual instruction in content areas, individualized instruction in reading and mathematics, and utilization of bilingual teachers and counselors. Non-English languages were taught as subject areas and were used to instruct non-English dominant or non-English monolingual students. Special emphasis was placed on appreciation and understanding of the relevant culture in each ethnic program through a multicultural and interdisciplinary approach to the social studies curriculum.

-- Dade County, Florida. A grant to the Dade County School Board supported a bilingual program for about 3,000 Spanish-speaking students. The objective of increasing the reading level of the students was pursued through a high intensity reading program, with individual diagnosis and counseling, and home visits. Basic concepts and skills were introduced in the students' own dominant language with subsequent reinforcement in the second language. Training sessions and workshops were conducted to familiarize teachers with new instructional strategies which are effective in multiracial and multiethnic environments.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Bilingual Vocational Training, Section 194 or Part J

Authority to support bilingual vocational training programs was authorized in the Education Amendments of 1974, Public Law 93-380. Title VIII, Part D of this legislation amended the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and, in Section 194(a), authorized the Commissioner of Education to make grants and enter into contracts with appropriate State agencies, local education agencies, postsecondary institutions, and private nonprofit vocational training institutions especially created to serve a group whose language is other than English. The purpose of the Bilingual Vocational Training Program is to provide persons who

have left or completed elementary or secondary school, and who are unemployed or underemployed because they are limited-English speakers, with training which will enable them to enter the labor market.

Evidence of the need for such a program is manifested in the 152 applications submitted in 1975 to the program from 34 States and territories. Languages proposed in the applications included Spanish, French, Chinese, Indian, Filipino, Eskimo, Chamorro, Samoan, and Micronesian.

The 21 projects, which were funded for a total of $2.8 million, are located in nine States and Guam and are training 3,250 persons. Languages in the projects are Spanish, French, Chinese, Indian, and Chamorro. Seven of the projects are located in community or junior colleges, six in local educational agencies, four in institutions of higher education, two in State education agencies, and two in private nonprofit agencies. The essential aspect of these projects which differentiates them from a monolingual vocational training program is the fact that training is conducted in both English and the non-English language; trainees acquire sufficient competence in English to enable them to perform satisfactorily in a work situation. Examples of such projects:

-- Two projects in Maine are offering programs designed for older Franco-Americans who will be trained to work as geriatric aides. Trainees will be prepared to serve as staff personnel in agencies for the aging to facilitate communication with Franco-American clients and to develop specialized Franco-American services.

-- Los Angeles Harbor College is attempting to meet the needs of limited-English speakers and equip them with skills to give them greater opportunities for employment. Areas of training include several categories of bilingual clerical work such as receptionist, clerk, secretary, and tax accountant, as well as medical assistant, dental assistant, health science worker, and industrial technologist.

-- The Lansing School District is serving a portion of the Spanish speaking population, many of whom are unemployed, by offering programs to train limited-English speakers to work as bilingual clerk typists, auto mechanics, and machine shop operators.

-- Two programs in New York City are offering training to members of the Chinese community who are limited-English speakers. The China Institute in America is providing training for service as professional chefs and will place the trained bilingual chefs in restaurants cooperating with the program. The Chinatown Manpower Project, which is the only manpower training center

serving the New York City Chinese community, is offering training in both para-legal and para-accounting skills.

-- Bilingual training in 10 different skills is offered to Spanish speakers in the program in the Rochester, New York, school district. Vocational areas include plumbing, masonry, carpentry, electricity, welding, clerk typist, nurses' aide, machine shop, graphic arts, and fire and police work.

-- A large segment of the unemployed population in Guam are limited-English speakers who have had no opportunity to enroll in bilingual programs. The Department of Education is providing bilingual training to Chamorro speakers in hospitality trades, construction trades, service trades, and business and office trades.

A Study of Bilingual Vocational Training, Section 192 of Part J

Section 192 of Part J requires the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Labor to make an annual report to the President and the Congress on the status and impact of bilingual vocational training in the United States. The Office of Education has initiated an exploratory study to collect information for the report.

Data is being sought from all 50 States regarding existing bilingual vocational training programs, enrollments, characteristics of enrollees, costs, and other descriptive information. To the extent possible the study will identify the methods and techniques of programs which appear to be successful as well as factors which inhibit success. The results of the study will be reported in 1976. Some of the highlights are given below.

Data from the inventory of bilingual vocational training programs for adults indicate there are 94 programs in 19 States for persons 16 or older who are no longer attending elementary or secondary schools. Approximately 13,000 students are enrolled at any given time in bilingual programs providing occupational training in nearly 400 courses in seven major occupational areas. The largest area, trade and industrial, has about 170 courses in 35 different skills.

Thirty-seven (38 percent) of the programs are in California. Sixty-nine (81 percent) are in eight States: California, New York, Texas, Arizona, Pennsylvania, New Mexico, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. Most programs are offered by local education agencies, junior and community colleges, regional occupational centers, ethnic institutes, Job Corps, or manpower agencies.

-- One of the largest bilingual occupational training programs is conducted by the Dade County public school system in Florida in cooperation with the Dade County Community College.

Approximately 1350 limited English-speaking persons are enrolled in 50 occupational courses scattered throughout the county in schools, the college campus, and 16 Adult Training Centers. These courses are in basic vocational areas: distribution (income tax preparation and management), medical (nursing), secretarial and clerical, and textile manufacturing (drapery and dressmaking). Most courses are open entry/open exit and the training duration varies widely.

-- Some programs are sponsored cooperatively by vocational schools and the manpower consortium. Cleveland, Ohio, has operated such a program for 5 years in a multicounty area for Spanish-speaking Puerto Ricans and Mexicans. The program offers 26 weeks in machine shop and related skills and 26 weeks of clerical training. All language training is job specific and takes place within skills classes taught by bilingual instructors.

-- The Texas Education agency, working with school districts in Brownsville, Laredo, and San Antonio, has for 6 years conducted bilingual office occupations programs for Mexican-American adults. These programs teach a wide variety of courses in office machines, accounting, and secretarial and clerical skills to classes of 30 trainees who attend 15 hours a week for 2 years. Trainees are required to speak and read some English upon entry. The classes are conducted primarily in Spanish through a bilingual instructor who provides English language training within the skill class.

-- Schools and community colleges in California offer at least 35 programs, more than any other State. Examples include the Vocational Training Center, affiliated with Reedley College, which has operated a bilingual training program for Spanish-speaking Mexican-Americans since 1971. The Center provides training in welding, ornamental ironwork, blueprint reading, auto body repair, furniture upholstering, and a variety of auto and engine repair courses, and is planning courses in office occupations and in child development and care. These are year-round open-ended courses which vary in duration from 5 to 6 months. Current enrollment is about 190.

-- The Santa Ana Unified School District is currently converting many of its occupational training courses into multilingual (English, Spanish, and Vietnamese) courses. The first courses to be converted were programs to train electronics technicians and dental assistants. These began in 1976 with 60 students. Trainees will not be required to speak any English upon entry into the program, and the courses will be taught solely or

predominantly in the trainee's native language, with job-specific English instruction included in each skill class.

State-Administered Vocational Education Programs

The Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended, authorizes Federal grants to States to support existing programs and to develop new programs of vocational education. Grants are made upon approval of State plans by the Office of Education. Section 102(a), Part A of the act authorizes basic grants on a matching basis; section 102(b) authorizes nonmatching grants to support programs and services for persons (other than handicapped persons) who have academic, socio-economic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regulation vocational education program; section 102(3) authorizes grants to support programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability.

The appropriation for the basic grants was $420,978,000 in fiscal year 1975; the program for students with special needs was funded at $20 million. No funds were appropriated under authority of section 102(c) (programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability).

Although the basic grants program and the program for students with special needs may include services for persons of limited English-speaking ability, the State plans submitted to the Office of Education do not necessarily address the area of bilingual education. The annual reports of the States, similarly, do not necessarily include information on bilingual components of programs or on services to persons of limited English-speaking ability. Some evidence of bilingual approaches are indicated, however, in some State reports. Some examples from recent reports include:

-- California reported use of bilingual instruction in some projects. The Santa Barbara City High School District employed bilingual counselor aides to offer career counseling in Spanish and English.

-- Dade County, Florida, provides training with bilingual instructors in distributive education, health related and public service occupations, industrial education, bookkeeping, typing, office practice, commercial serving, upholstery, nursing training, and other fields.

-- A program in Rochester, New York, serves 400 adults with bilingual instructors, counseling, job placement, and follow-up services. Training is offered in health occupations, food services, social services, clerical occupations, automative trades, electrical trades, metal trades, and construction occupations.

ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Adult Education Act (Public Law 91-230) provides Federal assistance to expand educational opportunities and to encourage State-administered programs of adult public education that will enable any individuals 16 years of age or older to continue their education to at least the level of completion of secondary school.

The act authorizes grants for adult education to States that have Annual Program Plans approved by the Commissioner of Education. For fiscal year 1976, the Congress appropriated $67.5 million for adult education grants to carry out this authority. The Federal share of the Adult Education Program administered by each State shall not exceed 90 percent of the total program cost.

The Education Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380) amended the Adult Education Act to provide for bilingual adult education programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability. The term "limited English-speaking ability" (as defined by Section 703(a) of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) when used with reference to adults means adults who come from environments where a language other than English is dominant and for this reason have difficulty speaking and understanding instruction in the English language.

The act (Section 302) provides for programs of instruction that will enable all adults to continue their education to at least the level of completion of secondary school and make available the means to secure training that will enable them to become more employable, productive, and responsible citizens.

The new amendments (under Section 306(11) of the Adult Education Act) provide that State plans shall (among other things):

> provide that special assistance be given to the needs of persons of limited English-speaking ability (as defined in section 703(a) of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), by providing bilingual adult education programs in which instruction is given in English and to the extent necessary to allow such persons to progress effectively through the adult education program, in the native language of such persons, carried out in coordination with programs of bilingual education assisted under such Title VII and bilingual vocational education programs under the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

To implement this new legislative provision, the regulations for the Adult Education State Grant Program (45 CFR Part 166.12(e)) require each State to include in its Annual Program Plan a statement which describes the policies, procedures, and criteria to be followed by the State agency in approving local education agency and public and private

nonprofit agency programs for providing bilingual adult education. In addition, the Guidelines for the Preparation of State Applications suggest that the State Education Agency describe:

(1) the criteria to be used to identify persons of limited English-speaking ability;

(2) the methods to be used to determine the appropriate design, and to develop and implement relevant programs of instruction;

(3) the proposed level of activity, including the number and location of persons to be served;

(4) the rationale for the allocation of funds in terms of dollars (or percentage of allocation).

Local education agencies, which receive Federal funds through State agencies, carry out most programs and must assure the State education agency that expenditures for bilingual adult education programs will supplement title VII monies and not amount to a duplication of effort.

Special Experimental Demonstration Projects and Teacher Training activities are authorized under section 309 of the act. Authority for the administration of this section of the act was transferred from the U.S. Commissioner of Education to the State education agencies by the Education Amendments of 1974. In transferring this authority, the act was amended to require that 15 percent of the annual Federal allotment to each State must be used for special experimental demonstration projects and for training personnel engaged, or preparing to engage, in adult education.

The regulations for the Adult Education State Grant Program have been amended (45 CFR Part 166, subpart D) to cover section 309 of the act; this subpart gives special reference to programs for and methods of educating adults of limited English-speaking ability. In addition, the Guidelines for the Preparation of State Applications suggest that, in selecting projects for funding under section 309 of the act, States give consideration to special projects designed to "(1) meet the special educational needs of adults, including persons of limited English-speaking ability...;" and to teacher training programs designed to "(1) meet the special training needs of personnel employed in priority programs such as bilingual adult education programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability..."

Section 310 of the act is another special part of the act which calls for educational programs for elderly persons whose ability to speak and read the English language is limited and who live in an area with a culture different from their own. This section of the law has never been funded, however.

There is virtually no information with which to assess the impact of the 1974 amendments to the Adult Education Act which were intended to give special attention to persons of limited English-speaking ability. Annual State Performance and Financial Reports provide very limited information on program participants, expenditures, and outcomes at the State level. For example, the following summarizes information from the three most recent years for which data are available.

	Expenditures (in thousands)			Federal Adult Education Program Enrollment	American Indian, Asian American, and Spanish-surnamed	
FY	Federal	Non Federal	Total		Enrollment	Percent of total Enrollment
1971	41,534	15,322	56,856	620,922	138,641	22.3 %
1972	49,693	17,371	67,064	820,514	252,269	30.7 %
1973	50,693	20,127	70,820	822,469	255,846	31.1 %

It may be supposed that many of the American Indians, Asian Americans, and Spanish-surnamed persons enrolled in adult education have limited English-speaking ability, but no figures are available. Also, the number of such persons who participated in bilingual education programs is not known. Note, however, that the enrollment of American Indians, Asian Americans, and Spanish-surnamed persons in adult education is increasing and at a faster rate than that of other population groups. A more detailed breakdown for fiscal year 1973 shows the following enrollments: American Indians 13,800; Asian Americans 43,954; Puerto Ricans 43,356; Mexican-Americans 79,328; and other Spanish-surnamed persons 58,848.

After January 1, 1977, examples of particular bilingual education projects funded under this State-administered program will be available from the Clearinghouse on Adult Education. However, prior to the Education Amendments of 1974, section 309 was administered by the U.S. Office of Education. Two projects dating from that time period are described below:

-- In Chicago, Illinois, the West Town Young Adult Bicultural-Bilingual Learning Center was set up to demonstrate effective methods for dealing with the problems of Spanish-speaking dropouts. Bilingual-bicultural instruction in communications, Spanish culture, and "mainstream American culture" is offered in a noninstitutional, community-based setting. The Center also tries to provide followup assistance to participants who seek employment training and further education.

-- Another project, in San Fernando, California, operates a learning center for the Spanish-speaking parents of children enrolled in Head Start classes. The Center offers a bilingual curriculum in family living skills. Two mobile instructional teams serve parents at selected Head Start sites on a rotating basis.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

The Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), as amended, is a State formula grant program, with required State matching of funds. The program is now in its 20th year. Its main thrust under Title I, Library Services, has been to promote the extension of public library services to areas without such services or with inadequate services; to make library services more accessible to persons who, by reason of distance, residence, language, physical handicap, or other disadvantage, are unable to receive the benefits of public library services regularly made available to the public; to strengthen metropolitan public libraries which serve as national or regional resource centers; and to improve and strengthen State library administrative agencies. The budget for LSCA Title I was $49,155,000 in fiscal year 1975.

The act is administered in each State by the officially designated State library administrative agency, which submits a State plan to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The State library agency, with the assistance of the State Advisory Council on Libraries and in consultation with the Office of Education's Library Program Officer in the appropriate region, is responsible for the development of a long-range program which identifies the State's library needs and sets forth the activities to be taken toward meeting these needs, supported with the assistance of Federal funds. The long-range program is updated annually as the prior year program is evaluated and the new program planned.

The Education Amendments of 1974 added a section to LSCA Title I to give greater attention to meeting the library needs of persons of limited English-speaking ability. The change called for State library plans to assure that priority would be given to projects serving areas with high concentrations of people with limited English-speaking ability (as well as high concentrations of low-income families). Final regulations to implement the bilingual amendment to LSCA were published in the Federal Register on June 12, 1975. States have submitted amended basic plans to include the required criteria and have included plans for programs and projects to implement them in their Annual State Plans.

Prior to the Education Amendments of 1974, several States had included services to people with limited English-speaking ability in their programs for the disadvantaged. For example, a review of the fiscal year 1974 State reports indicated that 15 States provided information that identified programs reaching bilinguals. These programs were funded at $2.8 million. From the State reports received to date

for fiscal year 1975 it is anticipated that some $3.7 million can be identified for support of such programs.

Following is a description of some of the typical activities reported by the States in reaching persons with limited English-speaking ability.

Statewide Services

The array of statewide library services developed for the benefit of persons with limited English-speaking ability by State library agencies illustrates the range of programs supported by LSCA.

-- An assessment of bilingual, bicultural needs is part of the State planning and evaluation process. Based on a State survey of American Indian library resources and personnel, one State plans to double the previous year's budget for services to this group. Twenty-seven libraries on Indian reservations will be strengthened.

-- Minority recruitment and training programs provided scholarships to attend graduate library schools. These have produced, among others, Spanish-surnamed, Spanish-speaking librarians and library school faculty.

-- A workshop for librarians working with Mexican-American children trained the participants in the selection of books in the Spanish language and about the Mexican-American culture and also in the skills of bilingual storytelling. The sponsoring State library agency gave book grants to the libraries represented for the purchase of Spanish materials. The State library agency is also building a special Spanish-centered juvenile collection.

-- LSCA provides for books and other library services to residents in State-supported institutions, including library services to physically handicapped persons, the blind, and other visually handicapped persons. Efforts are made to obtain materials in the language spoken and in whatever form can be most useful. For instance, recording programs for the blind and visually handicapped include native language materials.

Rural Services

Bilingual and bicultural users of bookmobile services include migrant families, Indians on reservations, rural residents, as well as patients, residents, and inmates of institutions located in the areas served. Mobile libraries have personnel who speak the language and know the culture of the borrowers. Materials include books and other

printed matter, films, and recordings in the mother tongue of users, and programs that suit the age and concerns of the group. Examples of such programs are bilingual story hours and film showings, job information, student assistance, and reading guidance.

Books-by-Mail is another delivery service intended to meet the needs of rural residents and others who are not reached by libraries. These persons include the homebound, convalescent, elderly, disabled, and institutionalized. Postage fees are usually prepaid by the libraries, and return-mail envelopes are included. Books in the native language of the bilingual users are included in the catalogs from which the readers make their selections.

The use of mobile and mail services does not preclude the establishment of rural libraries that serve bilingual clientele. These are found in increasing numbers on reservations and in villages and towns.

Urban Services

Many city libraries are designing new services provided by personnel who speak the language of the people in the area to be served. For example:

-- A separate library was established in a Portuguese-speaking community in a New England fishing center, with Portuguese materials, and providing opportunities for socialization and education. A library for the Spanish-speaking residents is being planned in the same city.

-- On the west coast, a city library is developing a library/cultural center for its Asian community, taking advantage of the experience it gained in establishing a nationally known Latin-American library.

-- Parent-centered programs for preschool children reach into public housing and low-income areas, offering special learning experiences to the bilingual parent and child.

-- Library-sponsored bilingual centers are located in community centers and multiservice centers as well as in libraries. Young people, especially, are "at home" in such centers and become involved in programs with opportunities to develop pride in their native language and background.

-- Mobile library services--provided by vans and mini-bookmobiles--give curb service and on-the-spot programs in neighborhoods, parks, community centers, and also at fiestas and other likely places and times for making contact with people.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, TITLE IV

Under the authority of sections 403, 404, and 405 of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act (CRA) of 1964, as amended, financial assistance is made avialble to provide awards for technical assistance, training institutes, and grants to school boards in connection with the desegregation of public elementary and secondary schools.

For the purposes of this act the term desegregation has a dual meaning:

(1) The assignment of students to public schools and within schools without regard to their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin and

(2) The assignment of students to public schools and within such schools in a manner which will provide all students with an equal opportunity for effective participation in education programs despite any English language deficiencies resulting from environments in which the dominant language is other than English

"Non-English dominant minority group" refers to persons who have been specifically determined by the Commissioner to be from environments in which the dominant language is other than English and who are therefore incapable of effective participation in the educational process.

Title IV awards are made in the following program areas and may include desegregation-related (Type A) activities, bilingual-related (Type B) activities, and sex desegregation activities:

-- General Assistance Center (GAC) Type A...Desegregation
Type B...Bilingual

-- State Education Agency (SEA) Units Type A...Desegregation
Type B...Bilingual

-- Desegregation Training Institutes...Desegregation and
Sex Discrimination

-- Grants to School Boards

In fiscal year 1975 the $26.7 million appropriation (including $5 million in supplemental funds) for Title IV program activities was obligated as follows:

GAC - Type A	$10,729,546	40.4 percent
GAC - Type B	3,750,000	14.1 percent
SEA - Type A	5,425,000	20.4 percent
SEA - Type B	1,250,000	4.7 percent
Desegregation Training Institute	3,255,000	12.2 percent
Grants to School Boards	2,170,000	8.2 percent
	$26,579,546	100.0 percent

This report will address only the bilingually related or Type B Title IV awards for GAC's, SEA's, and those Desegregation Institutes addressing non-English dominant language problems.

General Assistance Centers (Type B)

The purpose of the General Assistance Centers (Type B) is to provide relatively stable sources of desegregation assistance relating to the English language deficiencies of students from environments in which the dominant language is other than English. Such assistance is offered within each of nine geographical service areas (see below). The activities undertaken by each GAC-B were determined by an assessment of the needs in each service area based on the letters of request for assistance submitted by school districts. School districts requested desegregation assistance or training to meet the problems associated with the language deficiencies of non-English-dominant minority students in some of the following activity areas:

-- Assessment of the specific language proficienccy needs of non-English-dominant minority group students

-- Assessment of the specific language proficiency related to the needs of individual schools

-- Development of new administrative structures to accommodate changes caused by desegregation in a bilingual or multilingual situation, including the development of techniques for the identification and recruitment of teachers and other educational personnel with bilingual backgrounds and professional skills

-- Development of new curricular techniques and materials for use in classrooms containing non-English dominant minority group students

-- Development of techniques for school-community interaction to help solve educational problems created by desegregation in a bilingual or multilingual setting

-- Training of supervisory personnel responsible for conducting training related to desegregation problems arising in a bilingual or multilingual setting

-- Assistance in the preparation of applications for Basic Grants, Pilot Projects, and Bilingual Grants submitted under the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) which focus on the language proficiency needs of non-English dominant minority group students

-- Inservice training of personnel actually implementing an ESAA or CRA Title IV project which has as a major focus the language proficiency needs of non-English dominant minority group students

-- Guidance in the proper implementation and evaluation of projects supported under ESAA which have a strong bilingual focus

Since the GAC's work with school districts in an advisory capacity, specific problems may emerge which require specialized training for a district's staff members. The Centers are able to provide either the necessary training or to assist the district's supervisory staff in their training activities.

For fiscal year 1975 nine General Assistance Centers (Type B) were funded in the following service areas:

AREA A: Maine, N. H., Vt., Mass., R.I., Conn., N.Y., N.J., P.R., V.I.

Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, N.Y.

AREA B: Pa., Del., Md., D.C., Va., Fla., W. Va., N.C., S.C., Ky., Tenn., Ga., Ala., Miss.

University of Miami
Coral Gables, Fla.

AREA C: Ohio, Ind., Ill., Mich., Minn., Wis., Kans., Iowa, Nebr.

Chicago State University
Chicago, Ill.

AREA D: Tex., Ark., La.

Intercultural Development
Research Association
San Antonio, Tex.

AREA E: Mont., N. Dak., S. Dak., Wyo., Colo., Utah, Okla.

Coalition of Indian
Controlled School Boards
Denver, Colo.

AREA F: N. Mex., Ariz., Nev.

University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, N. Mex.

AREA G: That part of California south of the northern boundaries of San Luis Obispo, Kern, and San Bernardino Counties

San Diego State University
San Diego, Calif.

AREA H: That part of California not included in Area G

BABEL (LAU) Center
Berkeley, Calif.

AREA I: Wash., Oreg., Idaho, Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, American Samoa

Center for Bilingual Education
Portland, Oreg.

State Education Agencies (Type B)

Section 403 of Public Law 88-352, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, authorizes the Commissioner of Education "upon the application of any school board, State, municipality, school district or other governmental unit legally responsible for operating a public school or schools to render technical assistance to such applicant in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools."

Among other activities this technical assistance may include "making available to such agencies personnel of the Office of Education or other persons specially equipped to advise and assist them in coping with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation." The Commissioner may make grants for this purpose to organizations specially equipped to provide technical assistance, including State educational agencies (SEA's).

In fiscal year 1975 approximately 25 percent of the regular $21.7 million Title IV appropriation was used to support SEA projects to assist school districts with desegregation problems based on race, national origin, or sex. In addition, 25 percent of the supplemental $5 million appropriation for title IV was used for SEA projects assisting districts with the language proficiency problems of non-English dominant minority group students.

School districts often lack personnel with the specialized skills required for the language proficiency problems of non-English dominant minority students in a desegregated setting. Modifications in administrative, instructional, and curriculum methods, as well as in counseling activities, community relations techniques, and other areas may be necessary to make certain that high educational standards are maintained within desegregated schools. State technical assistance units are staffed by persons with expert knowledge in solving a wide range of non-English dominant and desegregation related problems. Because of their special competency in these matters, the SEA units act as an important advisory resource for school districts which request assistance.

SEA activities were determined by an assessment of the desegregation-related needs within the State, including the letters of request for assistance submitted by the school districts. Activity areas in which desegregation assistance may be needed by school districts include the following:

-- Training of teachers and other ancillary educational personnel in skills needed to effectively teach those children whose dominant language is other than English, including cultural awareness, proficiency in the appropriate non-English language, and teaching of English as a second language

-- Development of bilingual education programs, materials, and methods for use in desegregated classroom situations involving non-English dominant minority group students

-- Guidance to the district's administrative staff in understanding their responsibilities under Federal and State desegregation guidelines

-- Coordination with other Federal and State programs for more effective use of program funds to assist the district's desegregation effort, particularly in the relation to GAC's, Institutes, and local education agencies funded under both CRA Title IV and ESAA Title VII.

All State assistance units are required to conduct activities designed to make certain that, as a result of desegregation, administrators, teachers, and other educational personnel are not demoted, dismissed, or assigned outside their field on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

The SEA's (Type B) were approved at a funding level not to exceed the following amounts:

SEA	HEW Region	Funding Level
Illinois	V	$100,000
New Mexico	VI	175,000
Texas	VI	250,000
California	IX	250,000
Utah	VIII	25,000
Colorado	VIII	75,000
Ohio	V	25,000
Washington	X	50,000
Iowa	VII	20,000
Alaska	X	25,000
Rhode Island	I	25,000
New York	II	200,000
Connecticut	I	30,000
Total		$1,250,000

Desegregation Training Institutes

Section 404 of Public Law 88-352, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, authorizes the Commissioner of Education "to arrange, through

grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation."

Applicants can request funds for activities focusing only on desegregation on the basis of race or national origin, for activities focusing only on desegregation on the basis of sex, or for activities focusing on both types of desegregation. Although Training Institutes may be short-term summer workshops of 6 weeks duration or may be conducted over the course of a regular academic year, they must be generally designed to assist a specific target population in meeting specific needs. Institute grants are not designed to provide general desegregation assistance to districts on an ongoing basis.

School districts involved in the desegregation process often encounter problems which its staff members may not have been trained to handle. Problems such as racial tension within the schools, inappropriate curriculums, ineffective counseling techniques, outdated instructional and administrative methods, and lack of community support for desegregation may create confusing pressures for the district's staff. Under such circumstances a series of training sessions for selected staff members may be arranged. The training of administrative or supervisory personnel who can effect substantive changes in school policies and procedures is especially encouraged. Such training is most useful when it assists staff members in developing concrete strategies for solving specific problems which have been carefully identified. Requests for training services must be made in the form of letters from the school district stating the specific problems for which training is needed.

The types of training activities were determined by the assessment of needs related to desegregation based on race, national origin, or sex as outlined in the letters of request for assistance submitted by school districts.

In fiscal year 1975 a Desegregation Training Institute to assist school districts with the desegregation problems of non-English dominant minority students was funded for $74,496 at Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington.

EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN, ESEA TITLE I

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provides financial assistance to local educational agencies to expand and improve their educational programs by various means which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. The program is State administered. The States

approve local project applications, provide technical assistance to local education agencies, monitor the projects, and make required reports to the Office of Education.

Little is known about the extent of bilingual education in the title I projects. One source of data is the Consolidated Program Information Report for fiscal year 1973, the last year for which this report is available. In reporting expenditures by population target groups, it shows somewhat over $39 million expended on programs for "children from limited- or non-English-speaking environments." In reporting expenditures by purpose, about $46 million was reported expended for reading (non-English), other non-English language arts, English as a second language, and bicultural enrichment activities. About half this total was reported for English as a second language. Some 190 thousand children from limited- or non-English-speaking environments were reported as participants in these activites. These data are based on estimates provided by the State education agencies.

The foregoing statistics do not permit a statement about the prevalence of projects in support of bilingual education under title I. However, such projects are known to exist because in an effort to identify promising projects and disseminate information on them to the States, the Office of Education conducted a limited number of case studies of title I projects and among them found several for bilingual education. These involved bilingual teachers, teaching materials, and a bicultural approach.

The Division of Education for the Disadvantaged in the Office of Education recently developed and distributed for State education agency use a program support package on bilingual education. This package is used as a technical assistance device by State agencies in their efforts to provide leadership services to local school systems and to direct their attention to important areas of need.

ESEA Title I makes special provision for children of migratory agricultural workers and fishermen. Funds are reserved from the title I appropriation, based on the number of migratory children, for grants to States to support either directly, or through local education agencies, programs and projects designed to meet the special needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers and fishermen. Funds allocated for the program in fiscal year 1975 amounted to $92 million.

Inasmuch as 80-85 percent of the migrant agricultural work force in the United States have as their primary language one other than English, title I migrant programs spend a proportion of their resources to meet this particular educational need.

The most current study estimates that 67 percent of the total migrant allocation is spent in direct instructional services. It is

further estimated that not more than $15 million was spent on some aspect of bilingual education.

Although the methods by which the State migrant programs address the needs of the limited-English-speaking student may not be "bilingual programs" in the strictest title VII sense of the term, a broad spectrum of instructional and supportive services are provided. Two examples of State approaches:

-- The California Master Plan for migrant education states that "instructional programs will be designed to develop the basic language communication skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, with emphasis on bilingual proficiency for Spanish-speaking" and that "supplementary instructions for Mexican-American children will be planned with a bilingual-bicultural framework." Staff development priorities as outlined in the Master Plan include "Elements of successful bilingual-bicultural instruction" and "understanding of cultural differences."

The Master Plan also sets out in detail the provisions to be made for Spanish-speaking members of parent advisory committees:

> Project staff members who work directly with the children and their parents must speak Spanish and English fluently. All printed materials sent to migrant farm families must be in Spanish and English. Meetings involving migrant farm families must be conducted in Spanish and English for the benefit of any non-English speaking parent.

-- In Maryland, the migrant population in recent years has been changing from English-speaking to non-English-speaking. The need for a concomitant change in staffing has been recognized. The Maryland ESEA Title I program application states that "it will be necessary to hire teachers who can speak Spanish in order to accommodate the non-English-speaking students." The Maryland staff development component of the application has been instructed to address changing needs. It includes instruction in:

a. Basic language skills in conversational Spanish, particularly emphasizing the ability to discuss physical needs, family problems, and cultural issues

b. Knowledge of how to teach English to speakers of Spanish through a program of analysis of English and Spanish and the rudiments of applied linguistics

c. Knowledge of Puerto Rican and Mexican cultures and of the cultural differences between Spanish-speaking children and children of their ethnic groups in the schools. Attention will also be given to the relation between cultural differences and the learning process

d. Understanding the nature of the preschool child, the way he learns, and the environment appropriate to instruction for very young Spanish-speaking children

These are examples of how State migrant programs attempt to meet the special educational needs of the non-English-speaking migrant child. In all States native language materials are used and staff of like ethnicity are hired.

SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES, ESEA TITLE III

Program Purpose and Strategy

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides non-matching grants to State education agencies to support creative change in American education through innovative and/or exemplary projects and supplementary centers and to support guidance, counseling, and testing programs. These projects are based upon the results of a statewide needs assessment, and the innovative and exemplary projects are intended to serve as models which can be adapted by local education agencies in the State and in the Nation. Under title III, States are allotted funds according to a formula prescribed in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. To receive funds States must submit a plan to the Office of Education setting forth the proposed strategy for project development, selection, and management.

Funds for Special Programs and Projects (Section 306 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) which constitute 15 percent of each State allotment, are used by the Commissioner of Education at his discretion to support innovative and exemplary projects in local educational agencies. These projects utilize research findings and demonstrate successful solutions to major educational problems common either to all or to several States. The projects also give direction to the State Plan Program administered by the States.

Appropriations for the program in fiscal year 1975 were $120 million. Under provisions of Title IV, Part C of Public Law 93-380, 50 percent of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 1976 are available

to the States to carry out programs pursuant to the titles included in the consolidation of programs. Under this provision $63,781,000 was available for Federal administration in fiscal year 1976. Beginning in fiscal year 1977, the total appropriation will be administered by the States.

--Description of Activities With Respect To Persons Of Limited English-Speaking Ability. During fiscal year 1975, under the State Plan Program of ESEA Title III, the States estimated that approximately 186,000 Spanish-surnamed students would participate. A review of State Plans revealed that there were 46 projects in 11 States and 31 projects in Puerto Rico in which there was a major focus on Spanish-speaking students. Title III funds for these projects were an estimated $6 million.

Data from State reports indicated that activities supported for children from limited- or non-English-speaking environments included reading in their native languages, English as a second language, and bicultural education activities. However, as with title I, it was not possible to report how many of the title III projects were truly bilingual in character. Two projects from the State Plan program are described below:

-- A project in the Reading, Pa. school district for Spanish-speaking Puerto Rican elementary students was designed to

    a. teach English as a second language and the major disciplines in the native tongue;

    b. Increase competency in both the English and Spanish languages;

    c. develop a higher level of aspiration;

    d. decrease the dropout rate;

    e. increase the knowledge and appreciation of the participants for the Anglo culture and the Puerto Rican language.

-- A project in a Preston, Mich., elementary school for preschool through grade 4 children was designed to

    a. raise achievement levels in reading and mathematics in the dominant language;

    b. develop pride in the native culture and appreciation of others;

    c. teach a second language to assist in cross-culture interaction;

d. train a cadre of instructors to expand the program into other schools;

e. involve parents as reinforcing agents in the instructional process.

Under Title III, Section 306, in fiscal year 1975 approximately $80,000 was directed specifically at meeting the needs of Spanish-speaking students.

Two projects were funded.

-- The Roosevelt School District #66 in Phoenix, Arizona, was funded for $50,000 and served 190 students. This program translates the adaptation of the model Early Childhood Program (from Baltimore, Md.) into Spanish and seeks to improve readiness for reading, self-concept, and attitudes toward parents

-- The Berryessa (San Jose), California, project served 340 students and was funded at $30,000. It is a total instructional system in language skill, literature, and language systems based upon the Hawaiian English Program

FOLLOW THROUGH

Follow Through is an experimental program designed to assist, in a research setting, the overall development of children from low-income families enrolled in kindergarten through third grade. More specifically the purpose of the program is to (a) implement innovative educational approaches, (b) provide comprehensive services and special activities in the areas of physical and mental health, social services, nutrition, and other areas which supplement basic services already available within the school system, (c) conduct the program in a context of effective community service and parental involvement, and (d) provide documentation on those education models which are found to be effective.

The experimental feature of the program is the implementation of a variety of educational approaches with greater than average amounts of supplementary services and a high degree of parental involvement. The factor which varies in controlled ways and is thus subject to evaluation is the kind of educational approach used. As an experimental program, the goal is to carefully evaluate the alternative approaches and thereby to gain knowledge about those which work and those which don't work for children of low-income families.

The Follow Through program is authorized by Public Law 93-644, the "Headstart, Economic Opportunity, and Community Partnership Act of 1974," Title V, Part B, Section 551. The total fiscal year 1975

appropriation for Follow Through was $55.5 million, of which $11,172,778 was awarded to projects with sizable limited-English-speaking populations. Approximately $2.9 million was used in projects which were bilingual in nature.

The experimental program involves 20 different education models which have been developed and are being tested in school districts across the country. Each model is designed and monitored under a grant to a sponsoring group such as a university or an educational research laboratory, and is implemented locally by means of a grant to local education agencies. There are 164 local projects, including 24 projects which are not associated with any of the 20 sponsors. Several of the models are intended especially for children of limited English-speaking ability, and two are explicitly bilingual in character--the model developed by the University of California at Santa Cruz and the one developed by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

The aim of the University of California model is to have an educational environment consonant with the cultural and communication styles of the children. It therefore seeks to identify cultural variations in learning styles and then to develop the appropriate teaching strategies and curriculum materials. This model is implemented at one location, Cucamonga, California. Two hundred children are involved in the project; 75 percent are Mexican-American. The school district received a grant of $138,627 in fiscal year 1975.

The Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) Follow Through model uses an oral language approach to the development of skills in most curriculum areas. Emphasis is also placed upon understanding the various cultures represented in the classroom and in the community as a way of increasing the children's self-esteem. The SEDL approach is being followed in two urban and three rural communities. Two instructional forms are used: a true bilingual form in classrooms where many of the children are Spanish-speaking and an English as a second language form in other situations where children of Spanish, French or Afro-American descent speak a dialect form of English. The languages used in the SEDL Follow Through model (other than English) are Spanish and Cajun. Three of the SEDL sites are in the national longitudinal evaluation of Follow Through, the results of which will be reported in 1976. Information on all SEDL sites is summarized in the table on the next page.

Two additional Follow Through projects which include bilingual components are self-sponsored. One, in Van Buren, Maine, features an open education instructional model combined with a locally developed bilingual approach for Acadian French children. The project received $173,927 in fiscal year 1975. A second project, in Corpus Christi, Texas, is bilingual Spanish/English for Mexican-American children. The project received $263,397 in fiscal year 1975.

SOUTHWEST EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY, FOLLOW THROUGH SITES

School District	Form of Model	Language	Limited-English-Speaking Group	Number of Children	FY'75 Grant
Los Angeles, California	Bilingual	Spanish	Mexican-American	1429 97% Mexican-American	$654,482
Tulane, California	Bilingual	Spanish	Mexican-American	907 75% Mexican-American	$545,175
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Bilingual	Spanish	Puerto Rican	963 65% Puerto Rican	$227,268
San Diego, Texas	Bilingual	Spanish	Mexican-American	376 98% Mexican-American	$206,235
St. Martin's Parish, Louisiana	English-as-a-Second-Language	Cajun	Cajun	532	$301,701

RIGHT-TO-READ

The purpose of the Office of Education Right-To-Read Program is to provide facilitating services and resources to stimulate educational institutions and other agencies and organizations to improve and expand their activities related to reading. The Right-To-Read Program is a component of a national reading effort. The twin goals of the national effort are (a) to make sure that children in school learn how to read well and (b) to eradicate illiteracy in the adult population.

The program operated under authority of the Cooperative Research Act until fiscal year 1976, when it came under the authority of Title VII, Education Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380), National Reading Improvement Program, as amended by Public Law 94-194. Major thrusts of the Right-To-Read program to date have been:

(1) local education agency programs for elementary and preschool children and community-based projects for youths and adults not reached through other reading programs

(2) Statewide leadership and training grants to SEA's

(3) teacher preparation programs

(4) evaluation of reading improvement through use of reading specialists

(5) development and dissemination of effective reading materials and program models

Support for these activities was provided through discretionary grants and contracts to State and local education agencies, institutions of higher education, nonprofit educational institutions, and community organizations.

Although projects under the earlier legislative authority were not required to serve groups with particular cultural and linguistic variables, they were encouraged to focus on distinctive techniques, such as the utilization of volunteers, satellite reading centers, and community involvement for reaching persons with special needs, including bilingual and other groups not served effectively by traditional literacy programs.

Under the new legislation the school-based projects as defined through 1975 will be discontinued; a new program of reading improvement projects will be initiated under the sponsorship of State or local education agencies, nonprofit educational agencies, or child care institutions for elementary and pre-elementary grade students. These reading improvement projects must provide for the use of bilingual education

methods and techniques to the extent consistent with the number of elementary school-age children in the area served by the reading program who are of limited English-speaking ability.

For fiscal year 1975 the Right-To-Read Program staff identified 24 community-based and reading academy[1] projects with bilingual education components, in addition to an adult television reading series project and a parent education project. The community-based projects with bilingual components received $70,000 in fiscal year 1975, reading academy projects with bilingual components received $400,000. The adult television reading series and the parent education project were funded at approximately $881,000 over a 2-year period.

Total program funding for fiscal year 1975 was as follows:

Demonstration projects	
School-based	$1,284,669
Community-based	2,013,367
Reading Academies	1,449,221
State Education Agency Programs	5,215,122
Teacher preparation	1,496,497
National Impact Program	
Television	49,970
Dissemination	409,446
Total	$11,918,292

Examples of activities in projects with bilingual education components:

-- An Adult Television Reading Series is being developed under contract and will provide video tapes, student materials, and a teacher manual. The series is being developed in two components--one for teaching reading in English to functionally illiterate English-speaking adults, and the other for teaching reading in Spanish to functionally illiterate Spanish-speaking adults.

---

[1] Reading academies provide reading instruction and assistance otherwise unavailable to youths and adults through school- or community-based projects.

-- The Program of English Instruction for Latin-Americans in the District of Columbia assists non-English-speaking adults in becoming conversant and literate in the English language. It also assists the participants in cultural assimilation from the Latin-American culture to the American culture. It provides instruction in Spanish and Portuguese for reading and writing in both languages.

-- The National Puerto Rican Forum in New York provides a 15-week Spanish literacy course for Spanish monolingual adults. A second component of the program provides a 15-week English-as-a-second-language course for Spanish-speaking adults who are literate in their own language, have little proficiency in oral English, and are at the third grade or below reading level in English. A third component is a 15-week pre-General Education Development course for Spanish-speaking adults who are literate in their native language, moderately proficient in oral English, and are at the 4 to 6 grade reading level in English.

-- A Consortium of Adult Reading Academies in Greeley, Colorado, serves a large Spanish-speaking population, including a large number of migrant families. Volunteer tutors and paid teacher aides provide individualized instruction.

-- The Denver Public Library program serves the Chicano population in Denver. As in the other programs, satellite reading academies operate within target communities. The program includes English as a second language. A bilingual librarian is provided for the program.

-- In University Park, Los Angeles, California, a Bilingual/Multicultural Reading Academies Network at the University of Southern California serves the inner city of Los Angeles. Small group instruction and tutorial assistance are provided through satellite academies in the target area.

-- The Hacienda La Puente Unified School District in California is serving school dropouts or potential dropouts, homebound women, unemployed or underemployed men and women, and county jail inmates. In the area the minority population is 40 percent of the total population, but as high as 77 percent in some communities.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS FROM DISADVANTAGED BACKGROUNDS

The Special Programs for Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds are authorized by Title IV, Part A, Subpart 4 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. The specific programs authorized by the act are Talent Search, Upward Bound, Educational Opportunity Centers, and

Special Services for Disadvantaged Students. From fiscal year 1972 to 1976, the funding levels for these programs have remained virtually constant, with Talent Search receiving $6 million; Upward Bound, $38.3 million; Educational Opportunity Centers, $3 million; and Special Services, $23 million. The newest program, Educational Opportunity Centers, began operations July 1, 1974.

These four programs have as their common goal the identification and the delivery of supportive services to disadvantaged students to help them initiate, continue, or resume postsecondary education. Public Law 93-380 amended the legislation for the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program to include limited English-speaking ability as an eligibility category for participation. The programs are administered by the Regional Offices of Education.

Program Purpose and Strategy

Projects funded under the Special Services Program, located at institutions of postsecondary education, are designed to provide supportive services such as tutorial, academic, career, and personal counseling, and remedial or special classes that enable disadvantaged students to remain in school and complete their educational programs.

To implement the legislation as amended, Section 157.8, Bilingual educational projects, has been included in the regulations (45 CFR 157) for the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program. This section describes the minimal required services that must be provided students of limited English-speaking ability.

If an applicant receives funds to conduct a Special Services project that will serve exclusively, or a significant number of, students of limited English-speaking ability, the grantee must select the participants on the basis of their difficulty in speaking and understanding instructions in the English language.

Further, the regulation requires that students of limited English-speaking ability be provided special instruction in the use of the English language, either through the project or the institution's regular program of instruction, to overcome the obstacle in order to pursue successfully a postsecondary education program. Such students are provided bilingual personal, career, and academic counseling and guidance; bilingual remedial and special classes to enable them to complete required and prerequisite courses; bilingual tutorial services; and other bilingual supportive services necessary to meet their educational needs.

To be eligible for participation in the Special Services Program, a student of limited English-speaking ability must be:

(1) enrolled or accepted for enrollment at an institution which has a Special Services project

(2) a citizen or national of the United States or have visas which identify the individual as a person who is in the country for other than a temporary purpose and intends to become a permanent resident

(3) an individual with academic potential with a need for bilingual education, teaching, guidance, and counseling in order to pursue successfully a program of postsecondary education.

--Description of Activities Concerning Persons of Limited English-Speaking Ability. Public Law 93-380, which authorized bilingual supportive services, applied to project activities effective July 1, 1975. Because of the funding system (multiyear) adopted by the majority of the Office of Education Regional Offices, most of the Special Services projects were entering the last of their 3-year work program, which was approved in 1973. Since priority in funding was given to noncompeting continuation projects, limited funds were available to support new applicants.

In most cases, ongoing projects received the same amount of funds as in the previous year; consequently, the absence of additional funds prohibited major modifications to add, at this time, a component to serve more effectively students of limited English-speaking ability. Despite these limitations some activities can be reported:

-- Region I, which did not utilize the multiyear funding system, funded three Special Services projects that have components to serve persons with limited English-speaking ability. The names, number of students to be served, and the Special Services funds supporting each activity are as follows:

N. Shore Community College Beverly, Mass.	43	$10,500
Bristol Community College, Fall River, Mass.	17	12,000 *
Springfield Tech. Community College, Springfield, Mass.	115	23,000

-- Region IV funded Hillsborough Community College, Tampa, Fla., to serve 162 students with a grant of $73,000.

---

* These monies are from State funds; the Special Services funds are used to provide bilingual tutors only.

From these and projects in other regions where services to bilingual students can be identified, between 4 and 5 percent of the eligible students were receiving English language instruction or participating in special remedial bilingual classes as of December 31, 1975.

An indeterminable number of other students with bilingual needs are current participants in ongoing projects. However, in the absence of regulations, the eligibility factor on which they were selected was income rather than difficulty with the English language. Although separate and structured project activities have not been designed solely for their benefit, the students are often counseled, tutored, and otherwise assisted by project staff who are, themselves, bilingual.

With the publication of regulations and with open competition for funds during fiscal year 1976, it is anticipated that more Special Services projects will be funded that incorporate identifiable components which provide bilingual supportive services to students of limited English-speaking ability.

INDIAN EDUCATION ACT, TITLE IV

The Indian Education Act is Title IV, Education Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-318 (amended by Public Law 93-380, Title VI, Part C, Sections 422 and 423). Bilingual education project grants are authorized under Part B, Sections (b)(2) and (c)(1)(G). The overall appropriation levels for the program are as follows:

	Fiscal Year 1975	Fiscal Year 1976
	(in thousands)	
Payments to Local Educational Agencies for Indian Education Part A)	$25,000	$35,000
Special Projects for Indian Children (Part B)	12,000	16,000
Special Projects for Indian Adults (Part C)	3,000	4,000
Program Administration (GEPA)	2,034	2,055
TOTALS	$42,034	$57,055

Program Purpose and Strategy

Congressional intent in enacting the Indian Education Act was to provide greater educational opportunity for Indian children and adults. Legislative authority for working toward fulfillment of that goal was assigned to parts A, B, and C of the law. The following areas of precedence have been established:

Part A, designed to meet the unique needs of Indian children in public schools, as well as in Indian-controlled schools, will:

(1) concentrate on increasing the per pupil rate of expenditure for Indians

(2) encourage and strengthen the movement toward increasing Indian involvement, authority, and responsibility in the planning and general operation of their schools

(3) seek more adequate funding for teachers, teacher aides, curriculum improvements, and instructional materials in languages and other subjects required

to help meet the special educational needs of Native Americans.

Part B, which authorizes use of discretionary grants to work with Indian tribes, organizations, State and local education agencies, institutions of higher education, and federally supported elementary and secondary schools on special projects, will:

(1) focus on such national needs and priorities as teacher training, parent committee technical assistance, parent-based early childhood programs, and educational materials development, as well as on developing educational models in public, alternative, and Bureau of Indian Affairs schools to be funded under Part B;

(2) document, package, and disseminate these models and practices and provide the technical assistance necessary to establish them in a wide range of school systems.

Part C, created to help Indian tribes, organizations, institutions, and State and local agencies plan, demonstrate, and operate programs for improving employment and educational opportunities for adult Indians, will:

(1) concentrate on teaching to achieve literacy, increase the number of General Equivalency Diploma graduates, and provide wider opportunity for job training;

(2) stress social supportive skills through the use of culturally relevant materials and curriculum to promote a sense of self-pride based on Indian history and culture;

(3) place emphasis on the use of curriculum most needed by Indian communities, such as legal education, consumer education, vocational counseling, and community education.

--Description of Activities Concerning Limited-English-Speaking Population. The following is a listing of Part B bilingual projects funded in fiscal year 1975:

Projects	Amount	Ages of Students	Indian Student Enrollment
Alaska Native Education Board "Alaska Native Bilingual/Bicultural Programs"	$190,000	K-6	585

Navajo Community College Tsaile, Arizona "Navajo Education Center for Training Bilingual and Bicultural Teachers for Navajo Education"	$128,000	Adult	24
Covelo Indian Community Council Covelo, California "Cultural Development Project"	$ 88,855	K-12	150
D Q University Davis, California "Native American Language Education Center"	$175,540	3-8	500
La Jolla Band of Mission Indians Pauma Valley, California "La Jolla Reservation Supplemental Education Project (Aka La Jolla Indian Education Center)"	$ 28,060	1-6	35
Wampanoag Tribal Council of Gay Head Chilmark, Massachusetts "Native American Cultural and Education Program"	$ 45,000	K-12	200
Rocky Boy Elementary School Rocky Boy, Montana "Chippewa-Cree Research"	$168,120	K-8	400
Northern Cheyenne Research & Human Development Assoc. Ashland, Montana "Cultural Research and Curriculum Development Project"	$ 99,390	K-8	300
San Juan Pueble Tribe San Juan Pueble, New Mexico "San Juan Pueble Bilingual Program"	$ 70,000	K-6	250
Pueble of Zuni Zuni, New Mexico "Zuni Language Development/ Education Project"	$ 50,000	K-12	2000

Oneida Indian Nation of New York Oneida, New York "Oneida Pre-School Bilingual/ Bicultural Enrichment Program"	$ 50,000	3-5	70
Cherokee Tribe of Oklahoma and Cherokee Women Club of Cookson Tahlequah, Oklahoma "Bilingual Child Development Center"	$ 65,000	3-5	19
Plains Apache Indian Tribe Apache, Oklahoma "Language and Culture Program"	$ 24,500	K-12	450
Wichita Tribe of Oklahoma Anadarko, Oklahoma "Wichita Cultural and Language Program	$ 55,100	K-12	300
Tribal Council Ogalala Sioux Reservation Pine Ridge, South Dakota "English-Lakota Programmed Instruction in Health Education K-6"	$102,690	K-6	500
Quileute Tribal Council La Push, Washington "A Project for the Accumulation and Recording of the Quileute Language"	$ 25,000	K-12	200
Oneida Tribe of Wisconsin DePere, Wisconsin "Oneida Language Project"	$ 75,186	K-12	7000
Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council Lac du Flambeau, Wisconsin "Wiscorsin Native American Languages Project: Phase III"	$160,000	K-12	18,000

The following are representative descriptions of the bilingual projects funded under the Indian Education Act:

--The "Alaska Native Bilingual/Bicultural Programs" project will use an existing model to demonstrate the development and implementation

of bilingual and bicultural learning materials and instructional services in six rural Indian Aleut and Eskimo schools serving 585 students. The overall goals include: student competency in two languages; improved student self-image and social skills; narrowing the gap in parent-school relationships; hiring Native Alaskan people as instructors and moving toward teacher certification; and developing materials in each language for improving reading skills. Training activities include bilingual instruction training, inservice training, and classroom training. A linguist will work with Native people and educators to develop materials.

--The "Navajo Education Center for Training Bilingual and Bicultural Teachers for Navajo Education" program is designed to meet the Associate of Arts degree requirements at Navajo Community College. Indian graduates will be equipped to teach Navajo history, culture, and language in elementary and secondary schools.

--The "San Juan Pueblo Bilingual Program" has as principal objectives: a) to increase Tewa and English communication skills, b) to design a Tewa social studies curriculum for grades K-3, c) to provide staff development in bilingual education.

The design for operation consists of four main components: materials development, community participation, staff development, and classroom instruction. The project receives the cooperation of a local college, which grants college credit to project staff for inservice instruction.

STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS PROGRAM, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT, TITLE III

The Higher Education Act of 1965, Title III, as amended, provides for assistance to developing institutions of higher education which demonstrate a desire and a potential to make a substantial contribution to higher education resources of the Nation but which, for financial and other reasons, are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life. Activities supported may include efforts to improve the quality of curriculum, faculty, student services, administration, and other areas of institutional operations. Appropriations for the program were $110 million in 1975, with the same appropriations provided for 1976.

Eligible institutions must meet the requirements of the Office of Education for participation in programs supporting institutions of higher education for a 5-year period preceding the grant. In the legislative amendments of 1972 and 1974, Congress expressed its concern for the special needs of Indian and Spanish-speaking people by authorizing the Commissioner to waive these requirements for institutions which make higher education more available to Indians and to waive 3 years of the requirements for institutions when this would result in substantially increasing educational opportunity for Spanish-speaking people.

The program provides assistance to eligible applicant institutions in the form of "advanced" institutional grants and "basic" insitutional grants. Advanced grants are multiyear awards, extending up to 5 years, for the development of comprehensive planning, management, and evaluation capabilities, for undertaking special purpose programs and innovative projects, and for activities directed toward the attainment of financial self-sufficiency. The basic grants provide assistance in general areas of institutional operations among applicants whose pace of development is necessarily modest.

Basic Institutional Development Program

Basic grants in the amount of $53 million were made in fiscal year 1975 to 207 institutions. Among these, 26 grants were made to institutions serving American Indian students, and 24 grants were made to institutions serving substantial numbers of Spanish-speaking students. These grants were in the amount of $7.9 million to the 50 institutions involved. The funds supported various areas of institutional operations. The amount directed specifically to bilingual education varies considerably from institution to institution, ranging from support of counseling and tutoring services for students with English language difficulties to employment of bilingual instructors or development of bilingual teacher education programs.

Some examples of the range of activities supported which involved at least some components of a bilingual education program were:

--At Laredo Junior College (Texas), 12 bilingual instructors and counselors were added to the staff with title III funds.

--The College of Sante Fe supported development of a teacher training program, including preparation of teachers of Spanish, development of a new minor in bilingual education, and the addition of a bilingual/bicultural education major.

--St. Edwards University (Texas) supported bilingual tutoring services to students.

--Southern California College increased recruiting efforts for Spanish-speaking students and provided tutoring services for them.

Advanced Institutional Development Program

This program has awarded $10 million in multiyear grants from fiscal year 1973 through fiscal year 1976 to colleges and universities serving substantial numbers of Spanish-speaking students.

The following are examples of funded activities:

--East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles, Calif., is focusing efforts on improving bilingual/bicultural education for students. This includes revising and strengthening curriculum, developing bilingual materials for the learning resource center, and providing intensive courses in English for students whose dominant language is Spanish.

--Pan American University, Edinburg, Tex., is establishing a language and linguistics research center which will study the language and learning problems of local Spanish-speaking students. The results will be applied in redesigning courses and improving services provided students whose dominant language is Spanish.

--Texas Southmost College, Brownsville, Tex., is refining and expanding its SPEED (Special Services to Educationally and Economically Disadvantaged) Program. One hundred Mexican-Americans with minority/poverty backgrounds are recruited annually and provided with a highly personalized and individualized program in the communication and computation skills prior to admission to non-SPEED college courses. Included is an intensive program of counseling. Also funded are a study center and a program to develop bilingual materials so that students may receive instruction in their dominant language.

--The John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York, N.Y. The college's target population and open admissions students include substantial numbers of Hispanic students To assist these students in attaining success in the fields of criminal justice and public safety, the college is providing diagnostic testing, instructional and skills development programs, and special counseling strategies.

--El Paso Community College, El Paso, Tex., is focusing on curriculum development and improvement programs which will result in bilingual courses in the arts, sciences, and technical and vocational fields. Supporting curriculum development to further improve the academic success of the predominantly bilingual student body are a career awareness resource center, an expanded placement office, a testing center, and an improved faculty advising program.

--Cochise College, Douglas, Ariz., will develop materials and testing instruments in order to provide an intensive, performance-based language immersion program in both English and Spanish to non-native speakers. To further serve the needs of the large number of Spanish-speaking students, media materials and soundtracks in Spanish will be produced for courses, particularly those in the college development program.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION: RESEARCH IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The National Institute of Education was authorized under Title III of the General Education Provisions Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-318). The legislation includes a strong mandate to support equal educational opportunity through research for all children regardless of "race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or social class." Consistent with this mandate, the Institute established an Educational Equity Group among five other priority areas, and identified within the Equity Group a Multicultural/Bilingual Division.

The National Institute of Education Multicultural/Bilingual Division carries out a broad program of research and development that responds to the authorization in the General Education Provisions Act. Products and information from Division projects will be actively disseminated and, in many cases, already have been field tested or adopted with substantial numbers of children. Among these projects are the following:

--Catalog of Bilingual Curriculum Materials. The Catalog contains a descriptive and contrastive analysis of numerous curriculum materials presently used in bilingual programs for Spanish and Asian American languages.

--Teacher Training. A research-based teacher training workshop is under preparation that focuses on attitudes toward language-minority children and knowledge of procedures for instruction in language arts (oral language and reading).

--Catalog of Assessment Instruments. This catalog will contain a descriptive and contrastive analysis of assessment instruments used in bilingual education for language assessment, including reading, and for content area assessment, including social studies and math. The need for new instrument development will be reviewed.

--Reading Assessment in Spanish. Assessment instruments have been produced to measure progress in learning to read in Spanish. Further instrument development is presently underway.

--Supplementary Readers for American Indians. Readers are being developed for American Indian children that are based on cultural input from Indian communities. Panels of educators and community leaders also actively review the products as they are developed.

The Institute is also authorized under Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-380) to carry out a program of research in the field of bilingual education "in order to enhance the effectiveness of bilingual education programs" consistent

with the provisions of its own authorization. The National Institute of Education Multicultural/Bilingual Division was established in part to respond to this mandate. But additionally, the act authorized the Director of the National Institute of Education and the Commissioner of Education to

(1) undertake studies to determine the basic educational needs and language acquisition characteristics of, and the most effective conditions for, educating children of limited English-speaking ability;

(2) develop and disseminate instructional materials and equipment suitable for use in bilingual education programs; and

(3) establish and operate a national clearinghouse of information for bilingual education, which shall collect, analyze, and disseminate information about bilingual education.

Activities associated with the mandate are scheduled to begin with the clearinghouse, for which a study already has been completed on design considerations. Development of the clearinghouse will be initiated following additional analysis of user needs. Studies on language acquisition and the most effective conditions for educating children of limited English-speaking ability will also be initiated, as will the development and dissemination of instructional materials.

STATE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Introduction

The scope of bilingual education, as measured by State legislation and programs, is increasing. Seven States and the Virgin Islands now require bilingual education under certain conditions. Another 30 States either have legislation explicitly permitting bilingual education or have no specific provisions one way or another. Twelve States still have statutes which prohibit bilingual education. With respect to financial support for such programs, the picture is more bleak. Only 12 States, 3 territories, and the District of Columbia reported that they provided funds for classroom instruction in bilingual education in 1974-75.

These conclusions are based primarily upon two studies, one by the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law and published by the Center for Applied Linguistics[1], and the other by a survey of State education agencies

---

[1]Geffert, H.N., et al. The Current Status of U. S. Bilingual Education Legislation. Papers in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education Series, 4. (Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974).

and U. S. territories undertaken by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in the fall of 1975. The Office of Education is supporting a more detailed study of State bilingual programs, the results of which will be reported in the Second Report to the President and the Congress.

State Legislation Pertaining to Bilingual Education

--Mandatory Legislation. Seven States--Alaska, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Rhode Island and Texas--and the Virgin Islands now have legislation requiring bilingual education programs to be provided under certain circumstances for limited-English-speaking children enrolled in their schools who come from language backgrounds other than English. Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, and Rhode Island require such programs if there are 20 or more children from the same language background in a school district. Texas requires a bilingual program for 20 or more from the same language background enrolled in a given grade level in a school district. Illinois requires a program if there are 20 or more limited-English-speaking children from the same language background in a school; the Virgin Islands, if there are 10 or more in a school; and Alaska, if there are 8 or more in a school. In addition, the Pennsylvania Department of Education has issued regulations requiring school districts to provide bilingual/bicultural or English-as-a-second-language programs for all children whose dominant languages are other than English. The California bilingual education legislation requires school districts to provide special assistance to all non-English-speaking children but does not require bilingual education.

--Permissive Legislation. In nine States--Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Louisiana, Maine, New Mexico, New York, and Oregon--as well as in the territory of Guam, there is legislation which authorizes school districts or schools to develop bilingual education programs to meet the needs of limited-English-speaking children. In addition, the State program for minority and disadvantaged children in Washington includes, as a priority, bilingual education programs.

--1974-75 State Funds For Bilingual Education. Twelve States, three territories and the District of Columbia reported that they provided funds specifically for bilingual education programs in schools in their jurisdictions in 1974-75. (See Table 5.) The States were Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Mexico, New York, Texas, Utah, and Washington. The territories were Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands. In addition, Delaware, Maryland, and Rhode Island reported that they provided small amounts for training of teachers and other personnel to work with limited-English-speaking persons. Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, and Virginia reported that some State money supported programs or training activities for teachers of this group, but that the exact amounts and the nature of the training activities are unknown.

The 15 State-level jurisdictions that provided funds for classroom bilingual instruction reported a total of probably over $40 million dollars. (The exact amount is not known because some States did not separate money for classroom instruction from money for teacher training.) It should be noted, however, that the Trust Territory alone accounts for over $10 million, probably 20 to 25 percent of the total, and that four more States--California, Illinois, Massachusetts, and New York--account for another 50 to 60 percent. Only nine States were able to report the amounts spent by local school districts for bilingual education,and four States--Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas--accounted for approximately 93 percent of the total. With respect to local funds for bilingual education, then, the picture is very incomplete.

TABLE 5

EXPENDITURES IN 1974-75 FOR LIMITED-ENGLISH-SPEAKING PERSONS AS REPORTED BY SEA's

	STATE FUNDS	LOCAL FUNDS
TOTALS	$45,089,089	$56,753,132
Alabama	-0-	a
Alaska	800,000 b	a
Arizona	738,825 b	a
Arkansas	-0-	a
California	7,161,370 b	a
Colorado	199,000	a
Connecticut	-0-	1,652,045
Delaware	2,000 c	107,200
District of Columbia	d	700,000
Florida	-0-	a
Georgia	a	a
Hawaii	a	a
Idaho	-0-	a
Illinois	8,280,000 b	a
Indiana	a	a
Iowa	-0-	a
Kansas	a	a
Kentucky	-0-	a
Louisiana	1,360,000 b	a
Maine	-0-	a
Maryland	2,500 c	a
Massachusetts	4,000,000	10,000,000
Michigan	-0-	a
Minnesota	-0-	a
Mississippi	-0-	a
Missouri	-0-	a

See footnotes at end of table.

Montana	-0-	a
Nebraska	-0-	a
Nevada	-0-	a
New Hampshire	a	a
New Jersey	-0-	a
New Mexico	1,220,300 b	a
New York	8,477,151 b	13,001,530
North Carolina	-0-	a
North Dakota	-0-	a
Ohio	a	a
Oklahoma	-0-	a
Oregon	-0-	345,000
Pennsylvania	-0-	14,677,209
Rhode Island	50,000 c	a
South Carolina	-0-	a
South Dakota	-0-	a
Tennessee	-0-	a
Texas	1,850,000 b	15,770,148
Utah	250,000 b	a
Vermont	-0-	a
Virginia	a	a
Washington	450,000	a
West Virginia	-0-	a
Wisconsin	-0-	500,000
Wyoming	-0-	a
American Samoa	a	a
Guam	52,343 d	d
Puerto Rico	a	a
Trust Territoy	10,185,600	d
Virgin Islands	10,000	d
Canal Zone	-0-	d

---

a Data unavailable
b Amount includes funds for teacher training
c Funds for teacher training only
d Inapplicable

--Participation in Programs to Meet the Needs of Limited-English-Speaking Persons. Of the jurisdictions which reported categorical funds for bilingual education or other special programs to meet the needs of limited-English-speaking students, all except the States of Colorado, Utah, and Washington were also able to provide data on the numbers of individuals participating in the State-funded programs. However, the States were much less able to provide data on participation in locally funded programs. Furthermore, because special programs in a given school or district are frequently funded from various sources --including in the case of bilingual education programs, the Emergency School Aid Act, Title I and Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary

Education Act, and the local and State contributions--it is difficult to obtain an unduplicated count of children who are being served with a given type of program. Nevertheless, the yearly censuses of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Texas and the statistics of Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia provide total participation data as reported by these jurisdictions. California undertook a special survey of all school districts in April 1975 which provided similar data for the reporting schools and districts. The results of the regular censuses and statistics cited and the special survey in California are reported in Table 6.

Continuing problems in gathering reliable data on program participation for limited-English-speaking persons are the variations in objectives and types of programs and in the definitions of bilingual/bicultural education. In addition, even State agencies administering mandatory programs with relatively specific legislation and guidelines are often unable to monitor individual programs in all their school districts. To date it has been impossible to obtain data from State agencies in such a form that the kinds of services provided a given group of participants can be determined with any assurance.

TABLE 6

PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAMS FOR LIMITED-ENGLISH-SPEAKING CHILDREN

JURISDICTION	NUMBER OF CHILDREN
California	113,074
District of Columbia	816
Guam	3,281
Massachusetts	10,421
Pennsylvania	8,881
Texas	26,845
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	53,501
Virgin Islands	300

--State Bilingual Teacher Education Activities. Nine States and Guam reported that certain institutions of higher education in their jurisdictions were approved to offer training programs for teachers and others preparing to work with limited-English-speaking persons. The States are Arizona, California, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Wisconsin. In the case of Massachusetts, the State also approved seven institutions of higher education to serve as verification centers for the linguistic and cultural competence of candidates for bilingual teacher certification.

Fifteen States provided funds in 1974-75 to train teachers and others to work with limited-English-speaking persons: Alaska, Arizona,

California, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, New Mexico, New York, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, and Virginia. Alaska provided some of the support for the University of Alaska Native Language Center, which develops materials in Eskimo and other Alaska Native languages. The Center also trains bilingual teachers to work with Eskimo and Alaska Native children.

—Certification of Teachers for Bilingual Education Programs. Eleven States--Arizona, California, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Massachusetts, New Mexico, New Jersey, Texas, and Rhode Island—have developed special requirements for teachers seeking employment in bilingual education programs. In six of the States--Arizona, Delaware, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Mexico, and Texas--the requirements involve a separate certification for bilingual education teachers. In the cases of Indiana, Michigan, New Jersey, and Rhode Island, the requirements involve a bilingual endorsement or specialization in connection with regular certification to teach in the elementary or secondary school. California has both a separate certification and a basic teaching credential with a bilingual-cultural emphasis for its teachers. In keeping with its goal of promoting proficiency in French and other languages as "second languages," Louisiana has a second-language specialist certification but has not yet developed certification for bilingual education.

The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) approved common standards for all programs preparing teachers for bilingual/bicultural education programs in institutions of higher education. The Nebraska Department of Education, while it has not established certification requirements for bilingual teachers, adheres to the NASDTEC standards for bilingual teacher preparation.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Introduction

Bilingual television programs have been developed to address problems resulting from minority isolation--whether linguistic, cultural, or racial. The value of bilingual television lies in its potential for reaching a wide audience in breaking down minority isolation while maintaining the dual theme of the bilingual student as a member of an ethnic group and as a member of a larger and complex society.

The aim of the programs is to provide limited-English-speaking children with an experience that helps them learn English, strengthens their self-confidence, instills a deeper pride in their background, and helps provide linguistic and cultural bridges between the home and school and community. For English-speaking children, these programs offer an opportunity to become familiar with a second language and culture. For all viewers, the programs help demonstrate the diversity of this

country's languages and cultures.

Current Programs

Bilingual television programs noted below are currently funded by the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA), Public Law 92-318, Title VII. Several also have nongovernment support. Sections 711 and 704 (b)(2)(B) of ESAA provide public or private nonprofit organizations with funds to develop and produce educational television programs. These programs are available to commercial and noncommercial broadcasters for a nominal charge to defray the cost of duplication and distribution. School systems in areas where a series is being broadcast by a public or commercial station are free to copy it off-air for subsequent use. All ESAA television programs are available for school use without any additional fee.

--Carrascolendas. Carrascolendas was at first intended primarily for Mexican-American children in central and southern Texas but has developed into a national bilingual/multicultural television series over the past 6 years. Its initial funding came in fiscal year 1970 in the amount of $215,000; thirty black and white programs were produced and shown on stations in San Antonio and Austin during and after school.

The series received 2 more years of funding under Title VII, ESEA (Bilingual Education Act): $260,350 in fiscal year 1971 and $537,200 in fiscal year 1972. Thirty color programs were produced each year and were shown on 45 public stations in the 1972-73 broadcast season and 99 stations in 1973-74. The aim and format of the series remained basically the same although the non-Hispanic child also became a part of the intended audience.

In the fourth year, fiscal year 1973, the series received funding under Title VII, ESAA, in the amount of $1,268,730 for 30 programs which were carried on 151 public stations in 1974-75. It was still aimed at 6 to 10 year olds, but the producers were also interested in appealing to various Hispanic cultures--Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban--as well as Anglos and Blacks.

ESAA funding was obtained for fiscal year 1974 in the amount of $1,852,079 for 48 programs aired in the 1974-75 season. In fiscal year 1975, ESAA funding amounted to $1,674,000 for 52 more programs. In recent years, the target audience was expanded to include 3 to 5 year olds. In March 1975 the program was carried by 139 public television stations (and approximately a dozen commercial stations).

According to a Nielsen survey, the program can be seen in 57 to 58 percent of all U.S. television households or by approximately 40 million of the total 70 million households. No information is available on the number of children who view the program either in school or at

home. Evidence from its current Public Broadcasting System (PBS) airing indicates that Carroscolendas appeals equally to both English and Latino youngsters.

The series is produced by KLRN-TV, a nonprofit public television station in Austin, Texas.

--Villa Alegre. Like Carrascolendas, Villa Alegre is a Spanish/English series intended for both Latino and non-Latino children 3 through 9 years of age. The series uses both languages about equally in each show and the latin-American cultures as a context for the educational content.

Since its inception in 1972, through fiscal year 1974, Villa Alegre's producers have been funded by the Office of Education in the amount of $5.7 million. Title VII of ESEA made the original funding, but since fiscal year 1973, ESAA funds have been used. In fiscal year 1975, the series received $1,660,000 for 30 more programs. Foundations, principally Ford and Exxon, have also provided funding. An additional grant of $1 million has been made by the Exxon Foundation to underwrite production of 35 more programs, for a total of 135.

Each of the Villa Alegre shows concentrates on one of five content areas: food and nutrition, interpersonal relations, energy, environment, and man-made objects. The non-Spanish speakers are given an opportunity to become familiar with the Spanish language, and all viewers are helped to recognize the advantages of speaking more than one language.

The program is broadcast over 186 PBS stations and, according to a recent Nielsen survey, 65 to 66 percent of all U.S. television households, or approximately 45 million persons, are within range of its coverage. The program is being carried on approximately 20 Spanish language and other commercial stations.

This series is produced by Bilingual Children's Television, Inc., a nonprofit organization chartered in Oakland, California.

--Mundo Real. This bilingual Spanish/English series for children 7 through 12 and their parents is built on a continuing drama format, focusing on a fictional, mainland Puerto Rican family and the problems and opportunities faced by the children in it.

The series has received $250,000 for each of fiscal years 1975 and 1976 for the production of 20 one-half hour shows, 10 of which are available now and 10 of which are in production. It is produced by Connecticut Public Television in Hartford.

Bilingual Television Programs in Production

--La Bonne Aventure. La Bonne Aventure is a French/English bilingual

program aimed at the Franco-American children 3 to 7 years old living in Maine, northern New York, and throughout the New England area. The proposed series of twenty 15-minute programs will be taped in the studios of the Maine Public Broadcasting Network (MPBN) at the University of Maine at Orono.

The major goals of the proposed series are to foster self-esteem and to increase knowledge and understanding of Franco-American peers in Maine and other parts of New England in order to reduce minority group isolation and entertain children in the French language while exposing them to simple elements of their rich Franco-American heritage. La Bonne Aventure is geared to the preschool and K-2 audience--the formative years during which cultural and educational bridges to the existing educational system can more easily be constructed.

The series is being produced under an ESAA award of $249,402 to the MPBN.

--Que Pasa, U.S.A. Station WPBT-TV in Miami (which operates under the corporate name of Community Television Foundation of South Florida, Inc.) and Community Action and Research, Inc., have received $250,000 from ESAA for the production of 10 one-half hour television programs. The purpose of the series is to reduce the cultural isolation faced by Cuban-Americans as a result of bicultural pressures and to increase the awareness of non-Spanish-speaking teachers concerning the frustrations experienced by Cuban adolescents as a result of language problems in the public school system. A "situation-comedy" type format will be used, focusing on the generation gap in a typical Cuban-American family.

--La Esquina. This is a television series for Mexican-American high school students designed through the improvement of human relations skills, to reduce minority isolation and problems related to alienation. Action will take place in a restaurant, "La Esquina," frequented by Chicano and Anglo adolescents, around whose problems the series revolves. The Southwest Educational Development Laboratory of Austin, Texas, is producing the series under an ESAA grant of $250,000.

VII

EVALUATIONS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Federal bilingual education programs may be evaluated at three different levels: local, State and Federal. In some cases, as in ESEA Title VII and the Emergency School Aid Act, local school districts are required to evaluate their projects and report the results to the Office of Education. Although such evaluations may be useful to local authorities and Federal project officers, the data are not comparable and it is not possible to aggregate the results across projects and draw overall conclusions about the programs. The same is true of programs which entail State-level evaluations.

Federal-level evaluations are thus the only ones from which broad conclusions can be drawn; therefore, this First Report on the Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation will be largely restricted to evaluations of Federal programs. Exceptions are two Federal studies which describe State bilingual education programs and bilingual vocational training programs. It should be noted that this chapter does not include the results from research studies; an effort will be made to synthesize research results for the Second Report.

THE "PROCESS" STUDY OF TITLE VII SPANISH BILINGUAL PROJECTS

The first major study of the title VII program was designed by the Office of Education in 1972 and implemented under contract to Development Associates, Incorporated, of Washington, D.C., in 1972 and 1973. The study was an exploratory effort to provide descriptive information about a representative sample of title VII Spanish bilingual projects and to provide data for program planning. Its specific objectives included:

(1) describing a sample of title VII projects in terms of characteristics of teachers, students, curriculum materials, instructional activities, and parent/community involvement;

(2) analyzing the appropriateness of four "special projects" in research, development, and dissemination,[3] and determining the extent of use of their products and services by local bilingual projects;

(3) determining the impact of the Office of Education policy on the management and operation of title VII projects;

[3]These four projects were the forerunners of the network of centers funded in 1975. See chapter VI.

(4) compiling a list of attributes of projects that were subjectively judged as successful;

(5) determining the extent to which projects adhered to the Office of Education guidelines and whether such adherence was related to apparent project success.

This evaluation found that the title VII program did appear to have produced enthusiasm and commitment among personnel involved and to have fostered institutional change in recognition of the needs of non-English-speaking children. Most administrators felt that their districts would continue to support bilingual/bicultural education, at least partially, after Federal funding had ended. Regarding project needs, most directors expressed a need for more technical assistance in such areas as management and contracting, language training for teachers, curriculum development, and identifying sources of materials available. Staff members of projects generally indicated that lack of adequate materials had limited their activities, particularly in the fields of culture and history. There was also widespread dissatisfaction with materials that were already available. Field visits to the four "special projects" mentioned above indicated that large amounts of curricular materials from a variety of sources do exist; thus the problem may be in dissemination of materials and of information about materials as well as in availability. There was considerable development of curriculum materials at most local projects.

One of the most pressing needs of local projects was recruitment and development of a trained staff. Fully 80 percent of project directors in the study sample referred to significant or severe shortages of qualified teachers in their districts. Various short-term orientation programs or, on some cases, indepth training programs, had been organized to help prepare teachers for work with bilingual children. The training areas most often mentioned as essential by project administrators included the culture of the students, second-language training, and instructional concepts and methods of bilingual education. Regarding project teachers themselves, however, nearly half of those interviewed felt that they had not received adequate preparation for their work. The study also found that projects varied in linking teacher development to career ladders. While some projects offered similar assistance to teacher aides, others did not do so at all.

Most of the projects studied did have parent/community advisory groups. These groups generally reflected the ethnic background of project students. Attitudes among teachers toward advisory groups ranged from active encouragement to the view that they are a legal requirement to be honored in letter but not in spirit.

At the projects visited at the time of the study, 62 percent of the students were reported as dominant in the Spanish language; however, this judgment was sometimes made by schools on the sole basis of surname. Of the children listed as Spanish-dominant, 79 percent were described as speaking limited English or no English at all.

The median percentage of low-income students over projects was 80 percent. To the extent that project data on children's language dominance and competence are valid, the study showed that the title VII program is well focused on the children whom the legislation was meant to help, although this is somewhat limited by a high degree of mobility by children in and out of project schools.

Most projects based their teaching arrangements on a combination of a bilingual teacher and a bilingual aide, unless such qualified staff was not available. About 23 percent of the study-sample projects were using monolingual English-speaking teachers with bilingual aides at all grade levels. At some projects, paraprofessional bilingual aides were doing clerical tasks, whereas in other projects, the aides had an important role in teaching activities, especially in teaching the Spanish-dominant children. Most projects were teaching from one to four subjects at least partially in Spanish to English-dominant as well as Spanish-dominant students.

The analysis of the researcher's subjective judgments of project success and adherence to the Office of Education guidelines showed that (a) there is variation in project effectiveness as well as in adherence to guidelines, (b) high scores in guidelines-adherence tended to correlate with high success ratings, and (c) the guidelines which seemed to be the best predictors of success were those on materials acquisition and development, staff recruitment and development, project planning, and project management.

A basic goal of the title VII program is to demonstrate approaches to bilingual education which, if effective with children, can be implemented elsewhere at local expense. Most projects in the study sample (30 out of 34) believed that their program could be copied, but there had been few attempts by State agencies or local districts elsewhere to do so. Exchange of information about projects seemed to be on an informal, project-to-project basis. Yet, despite the lack of formal dissemination activities, the study found that bilingual educators wanted to receive such information. A good indication of this was the fact that 31 out of 34 projects had been visited by other organizations interested in bilingual education.

THE "IMPACT" STUDY OF TITLE VII SPANISH BILINGUAL PROJECTS

Following on the exploratory, "process" study, the Office of Education in 1974 designed an "impact" study of Spanish bilingual projects funded under title VII. Implementation of the design was contracted to American Institutes for Research, Inc. (AIR), of Palo Alto, California.

The objectives of the impact study are as follows:

(1) to assess the effect of the title VII program on the school performance of Spanish-dominant and English-dominant children enrolled in a nationally representative sample of bilingual projects;

(2) to identify and describe important characteristics of project students, staff, school context, and of the various instructional approaches in use at the projects;

(3) to assess the effects of these instructional approaches and of student, staff, and context characteristics on student outcomes;

(4) to determine the cost and relative effectiveness of these instructional approaches; and

(5) to assess, as far as possible, whether cognitive and affective outcomes of students are affected by the socioeconomic and ethnic composition of the classroom.

The evaluation focuses on 37 title VII projects in their fourth or fifth year of operation. The study design involves "comparison" classrooms of children whose socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds are similar, but who are not participating in bilingual education projects. For both kinds of classrooms, data are being gathered in the following areas:

(1) student performance at school in English and Spanish language arts, reading, and math;

(2) student attitudes toward themselves, school, and education in general;

(3) student background characteristics, such as language proficiency and parent expectations in education for the child;

(4) characteristics of teachers and staff with reference to training, experience, attitude towards bilingual education, and degree of involvement in project planning and implementation;

(5) classroom activities, language used during instruction, and interactions between students and adults;

(6) characteristics of the school and the district related to the bilingual project; and

(7) community characteristics and attitudes toward bilingual education.

A preliminary report on the impact study, based on data gathering and data analysis during the 1975-76 school year, is scheduled for completion in early 1977. A final report, including additional data collected in the fall of 1976, will be completed later in 1977.

THE "EXPLORATORY" STUDY OF TITLE VII PROJECTS IN NATIVE AMERICAN, PACIFIC AND ASIAN, AND EUROPEAN LANGUAGES OTHER THAN SPANISH

As part of the evaluation of the title VII program, the Office of Education in 1974 designed an "exploratory" study of title VII projects other than Spanish to see if the less prevalent languages posed problems not common to the Spanish projects and therefore not uncovered in other evaluations. Implementation of the design was also contracted to American Institutes for Research as part of the broad evaluation activity including the impact study. Site visits were made during the spring of 1975 to five projects with bilingual programs in Native American languages, two projects in Pacific and Asian languages, and three projects in European languages other than Spanish. The study's findings, conclusions, and recommendations were reported in September 1975.

The purpose of the exploratory study was:

(1) to identify unique features of the languages and cultures involved in those 10 projects which have resulted in differing approaches to bilingual education;

(2) to attempt to explain the relationships among those unique features, the approaches that have been used, and the apparent degree of success of the projects;

(3) to document any systematic difference in the availability of such resources as qualified teachers and appropriate materials;

(4) to document any systematic difference among the costs for bilingual projects for different linguistic and ethnic groups;

(5) to identify concerns and issues which appear to be common to any linguistic or ethnic group or to be common to more than one of them.

The study found that all 10 projects had reviewed at least some materials produced by other bilingual projects, and most projects indicated some benefit to them from materials produced elsewhere. The benefits noted included ideas for developing their own materials, basic materials that could be modified for use in their own projects, or supplementary materials that could be used in the classroom. The study also found, however, that the "special projects" funded under title VII through fiscal year 1974 with a "capacity-building" mission to develop curriculum materials or to assess and disseminate them, and to provide technical services to school projects, had not generally played an important role in materials development or acquisition at the sites

visited. Project staff reported that the unique dialects or other linguistic variations, cultural considerations, and curriculum needs of their sites required that materials development be an individual project effort. This attitude toward curriculum development seemed to be shared among most Native American, Asian and Pacific, and Indo-European language groups, judging at least from the study's small sample. Because of the acute lack of instructional materials appropriate to the local language and culture, project staffs spend a great deal of time developing materials--a task for which few have adequate training.

There is an obvious contradiction between, on the one hand, the expressed need for assistance in materials development and the interproject and withindistrict sharing of materials and techniques found by the exploratory study, and, on the other hand, the attitude that most of the effort in curriculum and materials must be done locally to ensure appropriate content. Reconciliation of this contradiction seems to lie in the fact that the sharing of materials produced by other projects appears to have, as its prime benefit, the spreading of new ideas, concepts and techniques rather than the specific materials themselves. The implication of this finding for the newly funded (fiscal year 1975) materials development, resource, assessment, and dissemination centers for these language groups is that, because of variations in languages and dialects, there should be, at least for languages other than Spanish, greater emphasis on the exchange of ideas and techniques in materials development rather than on specific materials which have been developed. This involves concepts of curriculum content, procedures to use in materials development, resources available to materials developers, and (possibly) training specific to materials development. Under this approach, the dissemination centers would periodically provide projects in languages other than Spanish with information about new materials, new techniques, and new resources which have been developed by other projects or have been made commercially available. In addition, center staffs would help to train project staff in materials development, and could provide technical assistance in such areas as editing, printing, design, and graphic reproduction.

Other findings of the exploratory study, pertinent to the service activities of the Title VII program, are summarized below with the recommendation of the contractor.

Differing Approaches to Bilingual Education

Because children's learning needs require differing instructional approaches, some projects have developed a "transitional" approach in which children move as rapidly as possible from working in their home language to working in English, while other projects have felt compelled to work initially toward maintenance of the home language and their children's skills in it. A case in point for the latter approach would be the several Native American language groups whose educational practice has involved learning an oral tradition, developed over centuries, which

is passed on to children in daily unstructured learning situations that involve various members of the tribe or village at different times. This procedure contrasts with the tradition of formal education in the United States, which uses English as a medium of instruction, spoken and written, in a classroom situation that has the teacher as a model and facilitator of learning. In an effort to make the two educational traditions work together for the benefit of their children, a number of Native American communities have given priority in their bilingual projects to the development of writing systems for their languages. They believe that what children have learned through oral traditions before coming to school will thus be reinforced and continued at the school. They also intend that new concepts and ideas can thus be presented to the child without his first having to learn a new language. Because of this situation, the report recommends changes in the legislation to permit alternative approaches to meeting the title VII program's basic goals.

Mixed Needs of Children

Some schools have mixtures of various racial and language groups. The report recommends changes in legislation so that children in bilingual-bicultural projects at a school may be grouped as necessary for those projects without violating the intent of civil rights laws.

Involvement of Nonproject Staff

The study also found that bilingual projects are often not well integrated into the district's education system. Teachers who are not part of the project may not feel either involved in or committed to it. Recommendations for improvement include greater emphasis on communication with the district's staff about the purposes, plan, and status of the title VII project; increased participation of nonproject personnel in planning and instruction (possible through team teaching); and anticipation of such problems as displacement of nonproject personnel or lesser inconveniences to them.

Project Funding

Projects often find it difficult to plan the next year's activities and to retain qualified staff because funding has been typically for 1 year only and notification of funding may come only shortly before the start of the school year. The report recommends that the Office of Education consider increasing the period of funding and make every effort to notify districts about funding decisions earlier.

The demonstration objective of the title VII program results in a limited period of project funding and, consequently, of services to children. School districts often find that they do not have the funds to continue projects as a service activity with funding of their own. The report recommends that national program staff assist projects in searching for other sources of funds, and that appropriate changes be

made in the legislation, in order to provide supplemental funding in communities such as reservations which do not have a tax base.

THE "EXEMPLARY" STUDY

The Office of Education has long been interested in identifying projects funded with federal monies which have demonstrably increased the rate of achievement gains for their students. Several studies have been conducted to identify effective or "exemplary" projects in compensatory education, focusing on student achievement in the basic skill areas of reading and math. As a part of the evaluation of the title VII program, designed in 1974, a similar study was untertaken looking not only at title VII projects but also at bilingual education projects under other programs, e.g., ESEA Titles III and IV (Indian Education Act) and the bilingual program under the Emergency School Assistance Act (ESAA). This study was also implemented by American Institutes for Research.

The objective of the study was to provide useful guidance to project planners in bilingual education, to parent and community advisory groups, to boards of education, and to teachers and administrators on what has been effective for children of limited English-speaking ability and can presumably be implemented elsewhere with reasonable expectation of similar benefits to similar children. Although the exemplary study predates enactment of Public Law 93-380, that legislation contains some requirements which are parallel to the objective of the study. Section 703(b) mandates that the Commissioner "establish, publish, and distribute, with respect to programs of bilingual education, suggested models with respect to pupil-teacher ratios, teacher qualifications, and other factors affecting the quality of instruction offered in such programs." Another pertinent mandate is contained in section 742(c)(1), under which the Commissioner and the Director of NIE must undertake studies to determine basic educational needs and characteristics of language acquisition by "and the most effective conditions for, educating children of limited English-speaking ability."

The exemplary study was completed in 1975 and resulted in the identification of bilingual education projects for which there was good evidence of success. The projects are listed in the title VII section of chapter VI; that section also describes the steps the Office of Education is taking to disseminate the projects.

THE STUDY OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS SUPPORTING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

In 1973, the Office of Education designed a multiyear study of federally funded programs which are intended to introduce and spread innovative practices in public schools. Referred to as "change agent" programs, they are meant to offer Federal funding on a temporary basis to school districts. The assumption is that successful innovations will be continued and disseminated by districts through other funds after Federal "seed money" is no longer available. Implemented under contract to the RAND Corporation of Santa Monica, California, the evaluation focuses on the ESEA Title III Program, but also includes the Title VII

Bilingual Education Program, Part D of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act, and the Right-To-Read Program. The objectives include (a) the identification of factors which tend to promote or not to promote various kinds of changes in the schools, and (b) the description and analysis of the nature, permanence, and extent of dissemination of innovations which are associated with these Federal programs and with various Federal, State, and local practices.

The findings from the first year of the study support those of the "process" study described above. There was very little evidence of dissemination of project models from one district to another in terms of operational characteristics, although the concept of bilingual education did cross district and State lines. Despite funding by title VII of the "Special Projects" for that very purpose, the flow of ideas about instructional techniques and materials was assessed as "inordinately weak."

Dissemination within districts was much more in evidence, particularly in larger districts where the title VII project served only a small proportion of eligible students. The benefits of staff training, management experience, materials, and experience with such characteristics of instructional models as staffing patterns and pupil scheduling were shared within these districts.

Another finding from the study's limited sample of projects was that commercially available bilingual materials were generally unusable without significant adaptation. One result was a great deal of apparently redundant materials development by local districts, and little systematic exploitation of this resource by the title VII program nationally. Still another finding was the severe undersupply of teachers whom project directors identified as "bilingually qualified." The shortage of teachers who match local eligible students on ethnicity was an even greater cause for alarm. State mandates for bilingual education were seen as possibly having a negative effect on cross-cultural bilingual projects funded under title VII. Competition for qualified staff could lead to "pirating" of the voluntary, federally funded program in order to satisfy the staffing needs of the State-mandated program. The rapid expansion in the number of bilingual education projects under title VII and other programs points up the urgent need for an expanding supply of adequately trained staff. Indeed, the plea for expanded training programs for persons interested in working in bilingual education was a common response of persons interviewed in the field.

Further site visits to bilingual education projects were made during the 1975-76 school year. The final report is expected in January 1977.

A STUDY OF STATE PROGRAMS IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

In 1975, in further response to the reporting requirements of Public

Law 93-380 regarding the condition of bilingual education in the Nation the Office of Education designed a study of State bilingual education programs for which there is a legislative mandate or State funding, or other commitment of State resources, or some combination of these. This study is being implemented under contract to Development Associates, Inc. (DA), of Washington, D.C. One perspective of the study is the effect on a State's activities of the Federal bilingual education programs operating within the State. These programs include not only Title VII of ESEA but also Section 708(c) of the Emergency School Aid Act, Section 306(a)(11) of the Adult Education Act, Section 6(b)(4) of the Library Services and Construction Act, and ESEA Titles I, III and IV (Indian Education Act).

The study's objectives include:

(1) a description and analysis of State programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability of any age level or occupational status;

(2) analysis of the status and accomplishments of those programs;

(3) analysis of State capabilities and activities for coordination of, and technical assistance to, bilingual education projects;

(4) determination of the participation of eligible children enrolled in nonprofit, nonpublic schools in the area to be served by the Federal and State programs;

(5) assessment of the impact of Federal policy in bilingual education upon programs and projects for language minorities in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(6) preparation of a critical analysis of the current activities and future prospects of State-initiated activities in bilingual education and development of policy-relevant recommendations regarding the improvement of State efforts in bilingual education and the coordination of those efforts with the Federal programs and with other State programs in compensatory education;

(7) development of recommendations on model State statutes designed to promote equal educational opportunity for children of limited English-speaking ability through bilingual education;

(8) preparation of 20 case studies on noteworthy projects or practices in State, regional, or Federal programs which appear to be particularly effective in addressing the issues defined prior to and during the study.

The study is scheduled for completion in the late fall of 1976.

AN ASSESSMENT OF BILINGUAL VOCATIONAL TRAINING

In accordance with the reporting requirements of Public Law 93-380's Part J (Section 192), the Office of Education in the spring of 1975 designed an exploratory study on the status of bilingual vocational training in all 50 States. The study is being implemented under contract to Kirschner Associates, Inc.

The objectives of the study include:

(1) identifying and describing current bilingual vocational training programs;

(2) reviewing the literature, evaluation reports, the reports of research, experimental, and demonstration projects, and other data on enrollments, characteristics of persons enrolled, expenditures, and outcomes;

(3) providing useful information to program staff on methods and techniques of bilingual vocational projects which appear to contribute to, or to inhibit, project success;

(4) through a feasibility and design study, developing techniques through which legislative requirements for assessing the impact of bilingual vocational training programs will be met in the future.

A report on the first three study objectives listed above was completed in the fall of 1976. The feasibility and design study was completed in the summer of 1976.

VIII

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

The focal point for Federal support of bilingual education is the Office of Bilingual Education in the U. S. Office of Education. That office administers title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (the Bilingual Education Act). Twelve other USOE programs, described in chapter VI, are to some extent involved in bilingual education. In some of these, authorizing legislation requires bilingual education, or at least requires consideration of the needs of limited-English speakers as a program priority. In some programs, bilingual education is simply one way of accomplishing the program goals.

Since the Bilingual Education Program relies heavily on a capacity-building strategy to help State and local governments to meet special educational needs of persons of limited English-speaking ability, the coordination of programs among the levels of educational governance is an important goal of the Federal effort. Coordination among other Federal programs which serve the limited-English-speaking population is also a responsibility of the Office of Bilingual Education.

OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

As noted above, the Office of Bilingual Education administers the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by Public Law 93-380, Education Amendments of 1974). Until 1975 the program was administered by a Division of Bilingual Education within the USOE Bureau of School Systems. (This Bureau was recently renamed the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.) In Public Law 93-380 the Congress provided that "There shall be, in the Office of Education, an Office of Bilingual Education...headed by a Director...appointed by the Commissioner...." As a result of this mandate, the Office of Bilingual Education was established within the Office of the Commissioner, superseding the Division of Bilingual Education.

Functions of the Office of Bilingual Education

The Office of Bilingual Education provides national leadership in development and administration of the policies of bilingual education of the Federal Government and for the coordination of the various programs which, in whole or in part, address themselves to the needs of persons of limited English-speaking ability. It is directly responsible for the administration of the Bilingual Education Act, which authorizes:

(1) the establishment, operation, and improvement of programs of bilingual education;

(2) auxiliary and supplementary community and educational activities designed to facilitate and expand the implementation of bilingual programs;

(3) adult education programs;

(4) preschool programs preparatory and supplementary to bilingual education programs;

(5) the establishment, operation, and improvement of training programs for personnel preparing to participate in the conduct of programs of bilingual education and auxiliary and supplementary training programs.

Organizational Structure

The Office of Bilingual Education is administratively organized into three divisions and seven branches:

—The Division of Bilingual Education Elementary and Secondary Programs. This Division is responsible for managing demonstration programs in local school districts. It determines needs and initiates and supervises the development of new or improved analytical techniques, standards, policies, and procedures for implementation of bilingual programs. It makes on-site analyses of funded programs for the purpose of identifying model programs and for the purpose of determining compliance with title VII regulations. Functions are performed through three Program Operations Branches for the Central, Eastern, and Western areas of the United States and its territories.

—The Division of Bilingual Education Postsecondary Programs. This Division administers a program of graduate fellowships through its Graduate Fellowship Branch. It also administers, through a Professional Development Branch, a program of grants to institutions of higher education, local education agencies, and State education agencies for training activities related to the capacity-building objectives of the Office.

—The Division of Bilingual Education Program Development. This Division administers and coordinates Office of Bilingual Education activities related to State educational assistance and equal education opportunity activities through its State Assistance and Equal Opportunity Branch. A Supportive Service Branch administers a program of support for bilingual education materials development, resource, and assessment/dissemination centers.

BUREAU OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Several units of the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) administer programs with bilingual education components.

The Associate Commissioner for Equal Educational Opportunity Programs is responsible for programs under the Emergency School Aid Act and title IV of the Civil Rights Act. There is a special set-aside of 4 percent of the ESEA appropriation for bilingual grants and special provision for bilingual education television projects. Congress also provided supplemental funds for Title IV, Civil Rights Act bilingual programs, beginning in fiscal year 1975, to support General Assistance Centers and State education agency projects to provide school systems with assistance in meeting desegregation problems related to language proficiency problems of non-English-dominant minority group students.

The Associate Commissioner for Compensatory Educational Programs is responsible for the ESEA Title I program, including the set-migrant students and the Follow Through program. Program operations are carried out through a Division of Education for the Disadvantaged and the Division of Follow Through.

The Associate Commissioner for State and Local Educational Programs is responsible for ESEA Title III projects, which are administered through the Division of Supplementary Centers and Services.

Each of these three groups of programs includes some aspects of bilingual education.

BESE's Office of Libraries and Learning Resources administers programs under the Library Services and Construction Act, which requires assurance in State library plans that priority will be given projects serving areas with high concentrations of limited-English speakers, as well as areas with high concentrations of low-income families.

BUREAU OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

Grants for State Vocational Education Programs and the special appropriation for bilingual vocational training programs are administered through two divisions of the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education. The Division of Vocational and Technical Education administers the State plan programs under Part B of the Vocational Education Act, and the Division of Research and Demonstration is responsible for the Part J bilingual vocational training program. The Division of Adult Education is responsible for programs under the Adult Education Act.

OFFICE OF INDIAN EDUCATION

The Office of Indian Education administers grants to State and local education agencies, tribal and other Indian community organizations, and institutions of higher education for elementary and secondary, adult, and teacher training projects, including bilingual and bicultural programs and projects.

BUREAU OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The Division of Student Services and Veterans Programs is responsible for administering the Special Services Program for Disadvantaged Students, and the Division of Institutional Development administers the Institutional Development Grant program.

RIGHT-TO-READ

The Right-To-Read Office, in the Office of the Commissioner, administers programs including community-based and reading academy projects with bilingual education components.

OFFICE OF PLANNING, BUDGETING, AND EVALUATION

The Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation is responsible for national evaluations of all programs administered by the Office of Education, including those authorized by the Bilingual Education Act as well as bilingual education components of other OE programs.

THE ROLE OF THE REGIONAL OFFICES

General assistance to individuals of limited English-speaking ability is currently provided through Regional Offices in four categories:

(1) specific program technical assistance under the bilingual provisions of the Emergency School Assistance Act, compensatory education under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and Student Special Services under the provisions of the Higher Education Act

(2) staff services to State and local education agencies utilizing "on-board" staff knowledge and experience in bilingual education

(3) coordination of conferences and consultation activities with State and local officials to ensure access to Federal resources for individuals of limited English-speaking ability

(4) acquisition and dissemination of materials and information on the activities of the Education Division which impact on educational opportunity for individuals of limited English-speaking ability

Approximately 30 professional staff members are currently assisting with bilingual education activities in the 10 Regional Offices. Additional staff resources are utilized when appropriate, particularly in technical assistance and dissemination efforts.

The Regional Offices have the potential and capability to become heavily involved in bilingual program development. The level of relevant expertise in the field ranges from proficiency in at least one language other than English to general knowledge of the culture and lifestyles of various minority groups and experience in effectively dealing with the problems of communities where minority children reside.

Most of the Regional Offices have at least the following sources of information dealing with bilingual and related programs:

-- Education Research Information Center documents

-- Federal Register

-- Records of federally funded programs

-- Information from the Division of Bilingual Education

-- Information about the Emergency School Aid Act and other Office of Education programs

The Regional Offices can also utilize other State and regional resources such as:

- ESEA staff members responsible for the dissemination of information on bilingual education

- The Civil Rights Act, Title IV, General Assistance Centers established to provide technical assistance to school districts which need help in complying with Civil Rights Act requirements to provide equal educational opportunity for school children with limited English-speaking ability

- The ESEA Title VII Centers for information on materials, training, and recommended practices and programs

COORDINATION

The Education Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380) include several titles in which reference is made to bilingual education and in which the need for coordination among the various programs is clearly established. The responsibility for administration of these programs is located among most of the major program organizations in the central and regional offices.

In recognition of the magnitude of the Federal bilingual education effort and the complexities of organization and administration of Office of Education programs involved, the Commissioner of Education has established a Coordinating Council for Bilingual Education.

The Council is charged with responsibility for developing strategies

to deal with problems of coordination, communication, and cooperation among programs identified in the legislation as well as those whose administrative responsibilities include areas affected by one or more aspects of the total bilingual education effort.

The membership of the Council is as follows:

Chairman - Director, Office of Bilingual Education

Members - Deputy Commissioners and Directors or their designees from:

Office of Management

Office of Planning

Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education

Office of Indian Education

Teacher Corps

Regional Liaison Unit

National Institute of Education

Regional Commissioners' Standing Committee on Bilingual Education

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
RELATED TO THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION REPORT

The primary role of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is to meet the Congressional mandate for a count of the number of children and adults with limited English-speaking ability (LESA). In addition, statistical support is provided to the Commissioner of Education for his mandated report on the need for bilingual education, the staff to provide it, and a 5-year plan, including cost estimates, for meeting the need.

Specific projects of NCES in this effort are:

1. "bilingual" supplement to the spring 1976 Survey of Income and Education (SIE)

2. "Survey of Languages" supplement to the July 1975 Current Population Survey (CPS)

3. fall 1975 Survey of Institutions of Higher Education (IHE)

4. fall 1976 Survey of Teachers' Language Skills

5. fall 1976 SIE Pupil Survey

6. fall 1975 Survey of State Education Agencies

Two of these six surveys, the CPS and SIE surveys, relate directly to the legislative mandate in section 731(c)(1)(A) of the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII, ESEA, as amended by Public Law 93-380, to report, not later than July 1, 1977, the results of a survey of the number of children and adults with limited English-speaking ability (LESA) from non-English-dominant environments. (Section 501(b)(4) of Public Law 93-380 makes NCES responsible for the survey.) The SIE, to be conducted by the Bureau of the Census in spring 1976, will be the vehicle of response to this mandate and will provide State-by-State estimates by language of the number of children and adults with LESA according to legislative criteria. Data from this survey will also be used in the Commissioner's mandated report to Congress due November 1, 1977.

The CPS supplement, conducted by the Bureau of the Census for NCES in July 1975, served as a pilot study for the SIE and also provided national estimates of the maximum numbers of children and adults in the population from non-English-dominant environments. Data from the CPS is included in this report.

The other four NCES bilingual activities stem from requests from the

Office of Education and will provide data to be used in the Commissioner's second mandated report, including an assessment of "the number of teachers and other educational personnel needed to carry out programs of bilingual education" for the target populations. The SIE will identify the potential child and adult populations in need of bilingual education. The SIE Pupil Survey will provide national estimates of the number of elementary school children, ages 4-13, identified in the SIE sample as meeting the legislative LESA criteria who are not being served in a bilingual education program or who are being served inadequately. This number will constitute the base number in the needs assessment.

The number of teachers and other staff required to meet this need will be calculated, using a selected teacher/pupil ratio. The number of teachers available to meet the need will be estimated from the IHE and the Survey of Teachers' Language Skills. The IHE survey will provide estimates of the number of teachers and other instructional staff currently being trained for bilingual education programs as well as provide detailed profiles on each college and university offering or planning to offer bilingual programs or courses. The Survey of Teachers' Language Skills will provide estimates of the number of teachers currently in bilingual education assignments as well as the number who have the language or educational capabilities to teach in bilingual programs but who are not being utilized in this capacity. Data on the number of teachers "in the pipeline" and in the "bilingual education teacher reserve" may be used to indicate whether or how many additional teachers need to be trained to provide a bilingual education to all who need it. In this respect, the Congress and HEW will be equipped to evaluate whether the current magnitude of the federally funded fellowship program for bilingual education teachers is appropriate to meet the need for additional teachers.

The Survey of State Education Agencies on Limited-English-Speaking Persons from Non-English-Dominant Backgrounds was conducted in fall 1975. This survey gathered information concerning the extent and availability of statistics on the number of limited-English-speaking persons and the programs conducted for them maintained at the State level, the legislative authorization for special programs for these persons, and the existence and characteristics of State certification requirements for teachers and other personnel preparing to work with them. Information was also gathered on college and university programs to train personnel for special programs for limited-English-speaking persons.

APPENDIX B

1975 SURVEY OF LANGUAGES

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Estimates of the size of the limited-English-speaking population in this report are derived from data collected by the Bureau of the Census through a special language supplement added by the NCES to the July 1975 Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS is a sample of housing units or households. About 47,000 households were eligible for potential interviews in July 1975. These households were located in every State and the District of Columbia and were chosen from a sampling frame of 461 primary sampling units (PSU's). Within each of the PSU's, enumeration districts consisting of approximately 300 households were selected, with probability of selection proportionate to population size; and within each enumeration district, a compact cluster of four households was chosen. Different sample procedures were followed in rural areas and in areas with new construction.

The data are collected by trained interviewers who are sent to designated housing units to conduct interviews. In each of the sampled households a 10 to 15 minute interview was conducted with any responsible adult household member who happened to be at home at the time. This household member was responsible for providing information about himself and every other adult household member 14 years of age and older, and about each child 4 to 13 years of age living in the household. Questions in the language supplement were asked about each child, and both regular CPS questions and language questions were asked about each adult.

ESTIMATION PROCEDURES

The estimating procedure used in this survey involved the inflation of the weighted sample results to independent estimates of the civilian non-institutional population of the United States by age, race, and sex. These independent estimates were based on statistics from the 1970 Census of Population; statistics of births, deaths, immigration, and emigration; and statistics on the strength of the Armed Forces.

NONRESPONSE

Approximately 2,000 households or 5 percent of the 47,000 households eligible to be interviewed either refused to participate in the survey or were not at home. Of the 45,000 households responding to the regular CPS items on employment status, about 3,000 households or 6.7 percent either refused to answer or were not asked any of the questions on the language supplement. (A small sample of these 3,000 households was taken, and indications were that many of these cases were telephone interviews conducted with the elderly.) Response rates varied for individual items on the language supplement. No missing values were imputed or predicted from

Information supplied in other items. Nonresponse should not have a large effect on the sample estimates provided if nonrespondents are not disproportionately persons with a particular characteristic. This assumption can only be validated through followup studies on the non-respondents.

VARIABILITY OF ESTIMATES

The estimates in this report are subject to both sampling and nonsampling errors. Sampling errors occur because a sample of the population is taken rather than a census or complete count. Nonsampling errors can be attributed to several sources, including the respondent, interviewer, questionnaire, and data processing procedures, and would also be present if a census were taken.

The standard error is a measure of variability which can be used to evaluate the reliability of the estimates in terms of the magnitude of errors due primarily to sampling. The standard errors as computed and given in tables A and B which follow include sampling errors as well as part of the effects due to nonsampling errors. They do not include any effects due to systematic nonsampling errors (discussed under "Nonresponse" above); consequently, the total error may be larger than stated. In addition, the standard errors shown are generalized estimates of variability which were computed for the language supplement items as a whole, rather than for individual items. This is common practice as the task of computing standard errors for each item becomes a formidable one when a large number of items are to be estimated from a survey.

INTERPRETATION OF STANDARD ERRORS FOR ESTIMATED NUMBERS (TABLE A)

Once the sample estimate and its standard error are known, it is possible to construct a confidence interval around the estimate. The confidence interval computed one standard error above the sample estimate and one standard error below the sample estimate tells us that we can be 68 percent confident (or the chances are 2 out 3) that this interval contains the average of all possible samples. For example, suppose that 500,000 persons are estimated to have a particular characteristic. An estimate of this size has a standard error of 70,000 persons (table A). One standard error above the samples estimate is 570,000 persons (or 500,000 + 70,000), while one standard error below is 430,000 persons (Or 500,000 - 70,000). The interval from 430,000 persons to 570,000 persons has a 68 percent chance of containing the average estimate calculated from all possible samples of 47,000 households.

By taking the sample estimate plus two times the standard error we can make the statement that there is a 95 percent chance (or the chances are 19 in 20) that this interval contains the average of all possible samples. The 95 percent confidence interval for the 500,000 person estimate would range from 360,000 persons to 640,000 persons (or from 500,000 - 140,000 to 500,000 + 140,000).

Standard errors for estimates not given in table A can be easily interpolated. For example, suppose we want the standard error for an estimate of 3,000,000 persons. The standard error of this estimate can be determined by interpolating between the standard errors shown in table A for 2,500,000 persons and 5,000,000 persons and is approximately 177,000 persons.

INTERPRETATION OF STANDARD ERRORS FOR ESTIMATED PERCENTAGES (TABLE B)

Variability estimates are given in table B for estimates expressed in percentages. Standard errors for estimated percentages depend on the magnitude of the percentage itself and on the magnitude of the base from which the percentage was calculated. Confidence intervals are computed and interpreted in the same way as discussed above. For example, suppose that 5 percent of the persons in the survey have a particular characteristic and that this percentage is derived from a base of 5,000,000 persons. The standard error shown in table B is 1.0 percent. Consequently, the 95 percent confidence interval would range from 3 to 7 percent. We would have 95 percent confidence that this interval contains the average percentage calculated from all possible samples of 47,000 households.

Standard errors for estimated percentages not given in table B can also be interpolated. However, this may involve interpolating for either the estimated percentage or base of the percentage or for both. For example, suppose we want to estimate the standard error for a 15 percent estimate derived from a base of 1,500,000 persons. Using table B, interpolate the standard error for a 15 percent estimate first using a base of 1,000,000 persons (resulting in an error of 3.4 percent) and then using a base of 2,500,000 persons (resulting in a standard error of 2.2 percent). Interpolate the standard error for a base of 1,500,000 persons using the standard errors derived above. This procedure results in a standard error of approximately 3.0 percent for a 15 percent estimate with a base of 1,500,000 persons.

TABLE A

STANDARD ERROR OF ESTIMATED NUMBERS OF PERSONS

(68 chances out of 100)

Size of estimate	Standard error	Size of estimate	Standard error
		1,000,000	102,000
25,000	13,000	2,500,000	164,000
50,000	20,000	5,000,000	229,000
100,000	29,000	10,000,000	315,000
250,000	49,000	25,000,000	500,000
500,000	70,000	50,000,000	620,000

TABLE B

STANDARD ERRORS OF ESTIMATED PERCENTAGES OF PERSONS

(68 chances out of 100)

Estimated percentage	Base of percentage (thousands)											
	50	100	250	500	1,000	2,500	5,000	10,000	25,000	50,000	100,000	200,000
2 or 98	6.2	4.4	2.8	2.0	1.4	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1
5 or 95	9.6	6.8	4.3	3.0	2.1	1.4	1.0	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1
10 or 90	13.2	9.4	5.9	4.2	3.0	1.9	1.3	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2
25 or 75	19.1	13.5	8.5	6.0	4.3	2.7	1.9	1.4	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.3
35 or 65	21.0	14.9	9.4	6.7	4.7	3.0	2.1	1.5	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.3
50	22.0	15.6	9.9	7.0	4.9	3.1	2.2	1.6	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.3

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF H.E.W.
HEW 395
SPECIAL FOURTH CLASS
RATE - BOOK

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE / Office of Education
HEW Publication No. (OE) 77-01704